

PROGRAM EVALUATION

KENTUCKY'S
TEACHER PREPARATION SYSTEM

Research Report No. 243

Legislative Research Commission

Frankfort, Ky.

Committee for Program Review & Investigation

KENTUCKY LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMISSION

JOHN A. "ECK" ROSE
Senate President Pro Tem

DONALD J. BLANDFORD
House Speaker

Chairmen

Senate Members

CHARLES W. BERGER
Assistant President Pro Tem

JOE WRIGHT
Majority Floor Leader

JOHN D. ROGERS
Minority Floor Leader

DAVID K. KAREM
Majority Caucus Chairman

DR. JACK TREVEY
Minority Caucus Chairman

HELEN GARRETT
Majority Whip

EUGENE P. STUART
Minority Whip

House Members

PETE WORTHINGTON
Speaker Pro Tem

GREGORY D. STUMBO
Majority Floor Leader

WILLIAM STRONG
Minority Floor Leader

JODY RICHARDS
Majority Caucus Chairman

KEN HARPER
Minority Caucus Chairman

KENNY RAPIER
Majority Whip

BILL LILE
Minority Whip

VIC HELLARD, JR, Director

* * * * *

The Kentucky Legislative Research Commission is a sixteen member committee, comprised of the majority and minority leadership of the Kentucky Senate and House of Representatives. Under Chapter 7 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes, the Commission constitutes the administrative office for the Kentucky General Assembly. Its director serves as chief administrative officer of the Legislature when it is not in session.

The Commission and its staff, by law and by practice, perform numerous fact-finding and service functions for members of the General Assembly. The Commission provides professional, clerical and other employees required by legislators when the General Assembly is in session and during the interim period between sessions. These employees, in turn, assist committees and individual members in preparing legislation. Other services include conducting studies and investigations, organizing and staffing committee meetings and public hearings, maintaining official legislative records and other reference materials, furnishing information about the Legislature to the public, compiling and publishing administrative regulations, administering a legislative intern program, conducting a pre-session orientation conference for legislators, and publishing a daily index of legislative activity during sessions of the General Assembly.

The Commission is also responsible for statute revision, publication and distribution of the *Acts* and *Journals* following sessions of the General Assembly and for maintaining furnishings, equipment and supplies for the Legislature.

The Commission functions as Kentucky's Commission on Interstate Cooperation in carrying out the program of the Council of State Governments as it relates to Kentucky.

PROGRAM EVALUATION KENTUCKY'S TEACHER PREPARATION SYSTEM

**Adopted Report and Recommendations of the
Program Review and Investigations Committee**

**Prepared by
Office for Program Review and Investigations**

Joe Fiala, Ph.D.
LRC Assistant Director

Sheila Mason
Project Manager

Roger Sugarman
Anne Armstrong
Betty Davis
Project Staff

**Research Report No. 243
Legislative Research Commission
October, 1989**

PROGRAM REVIEW AND INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE

SENATOR LOUIS T. PENISTON
Chairman

REPRESENTATIVE C. M. "HANK" HANCOCK
Chairman

SENATE MEMBERS

**FRED BRADLEY
BILL CLOUSE
JOSEPH U. MEYER
ED O'DANIEL
JOHN ROGERS
ART SCHMIDT
TIM SHAUGHNESSY.**

HOUSE MEMBERS

**ADRIAN ARNOLD
JOE BARROWS
PAT FREIBERT
KENNETH HARPER
TOM JONES
HARRY MOBERLY, JR.
MARK O'BRIEN**

JOSEPH F. FIALA, Ph.D.
Assistant Director for Program Review and Investigations

* * * * *

The Program Review and Investigations Committee is a 16-member bipartisan committee. According to KRS Chapter 6, the Committee has the power to review the operations of state agencies and programs, to determine whether funds are being spent for the purposes for which they were appropriated, to evaluate the efficiency of program operations and to evaluate the impact of state government reorganizations.

Under KRS Chapter 6, all state agencies are required to cooperate with the Committee by providing requested information and by permitting the opportunity to observe operations. The Committee also has the authority to subpoena witnesses and documents and to administer oaths. Agencies are obligated to correct operational problems identified by the Committee, and must implement the Committee's recommended actions or propose suitable alternatives.

Requests for review may be made by any official of the executive, judicial or legislative branches of government. Final determination of research topics, scope, methodology and recommendations is made by majority vote of the Committee. Final reports, although based upon staff research and proposals, represent the official opinion of a majority of the Committee membership. Final reports are issued after public deliberations involving agency responses and public input.

FOREWORD

The 1988 General Assembly requested in House Joint Resolution 81 that the Program Review and Investigations committee evaluate Kentucky's Teacher Preparation System. The report and its recommendations were adopted by the Program Review and Investigations Committee on May 1, 1989 for submission to the Legislative Research Commission and the Interim Joint Committee on Education.

The report is the result of dedicated time and effort by the Program Review staff and secretaries, Susie Reed and Wilda Bond. Our appreciation is also expressed to the personnel of the Department of Education and the Council on Higher Education, to the teachers and administrators who responded to the Committee's surveys, and to all other persons interviewed for this study.

Vic Hellard, Jr.
Director

Frankfort, Kentucky
June, 1989



SENATE MEMBERS

Charles W. Berger
Assistant President Pro Tem

Joe Wright
Majority Floor Leader

John D. Rogers
Minority Floor Leader

David K. Karem
Majority Caucus Chairman

Dr. Jack Trevey
Minority Caucus Chairman

Helen Garrett
Majority Whip

Eugene P. Stuart
Minority Whip

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMISSION

State Capitol

Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

502-564-8100

John A. "Eck" Rose, Senate President Pro Tem

Donald J. Blandford, House Speaker

Chairmen

Vic Hellard, Jr.
Director

HOUSE MEMBERS

Pete Worthington
Speaker Pro Tem

Gregory D. Stumbo
Majority Floor Leader

William Strong
Minority Floor Leader

Jody Richards
Majority Caucus Chairman

Ken Harper
Minority Caucus Chairman

Kenny Rapier
Majority Whip

Bill Lile
Minority Whip

TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Wallace Wilkinson,
The Legislative Research Commission, and Affected
Agency Heads and Interested Individuals

FROM: Representative C. M. "Hank" Hancock, Chairman
Program Review and Investigations Committee

DATE: June 20, 1989

RE: Program Evaluation: Kentucky's Teacher Preparation System

Attached are the final report and recommendations of a study directed by the 1988 Regular Session of the Kentucky General Assembly. Data and information were gathered by literature, record and document reviews; interviews with education officials, representatives of the education profession, advocates of education, deans and education board members; and surveys of local school teachers, administrators and universities.

Recent upgrades in teacher preparation throughout the 1980s, though too early to evaluate, are supported by the recommendations of expert state and national study groups, Kentucky teachers and administrators, and approaches in other states. These requirements, which other states have or are exploring, include a 2.5 G.P.A., passage of competency tests, a one-year internship, and fifth-year academic training. The State Board of Education (SBE) certifies and endorses teacher competencies in very specific subjects and grades, leading to criticisms of the system as being confusing and inflexible. University programs for certification and endorsement are specified by the SBE to a course curriculum level. Universities feel this restricts their academic freedom; however, survey results indicate some wide variations among universities in total course requirements. A recommendation is made for the SBE to encourage universities to use proficiency tests and life experience credit more often to assist students with previous experience to complete programs more quickly.

Kentucky requires professional development for advancement in rank and salary and for maintenance of certification. However, requirements assume that participation increases performance. Moreover, these requirements decrease significantly after ten years. In the first ten years teachers must attend four in-service days per year and obtain a Master's degree or fifth-year educational equivalent. Four days of in-service per year and three years of teaching in five years are required thereafter. In-service is provided by local districts based upon legislatively mandated topics, Department of Education in-service and district-wide training needs. Few districts use flexible approaches allowing more individual oriented development. Recommendations are made to require that teacher assessment results be considered in designing fifth-year programs; require all local districts to survey teachers as to in-service needs; and require the DOE to study the cost/effectiveness of designating one existing or a new in-service day for individual teacher needs.

Kentucky's teacher compensation system is based upon ranks obtained through completing various educational requirements, notably the fifth-year program and course work beyond. Career ladder and bonus pay plans have been piloted but not implemented. However, the evaluation component of a bonus pay plan has been implemented and local districts must now evaluate teachers and administrators. Teachers, generally, are not in favor of a career ladder approach because of the teacher hierarchy it creates. Moreover, many do not favor performance-based systems because of concerns over the evaluation process. Recommendations are made that the General Assembly and the SBE should continue to monitor research on alternative teacher classification systems and that the SBE should incorporate a review of the district teacher evaluation plan into the accreditation process.

Teacher programs are evaluated by national accreditation and state accreditation bodies (using national standards). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the SBE accredit university programs on a five-year review cycle. The Council on Higher Education (CHE) reviews programs every five years for need, student demand and duplication, among other things. A few universities perform their own outcome evaluations; however, none of the state-level reviews utilize outcome measures formally in their review process. Valid program approval outcome measures are not currently available in Kentucky. Nevertheless, other states are beginning to use them to judge the performance of their training programs. In the early 1980's SBE accreditation reviews became sporadic and currently there is some criticism over the uniformity of enforcement. The SBE and the DOE have made changes since 1985 to strengthen the process and reinstate the five-year cycle. Recommendations are made that the SBE should continue its efforts at strengthening the accreditation process and should maintain the five-year cycle; the SBE and the CHE should coordinate their reviews to reduce the burden on universities; and the DOE should incorporate current performance indicators into the accreditation process and, with the assistance of the CHE, work on the development of more valid performance indicators for the next five-year cycle.

Teacher supply problems exist in certain areas. Geographically, more shortages exist in rural areas than in urban areas. There are shortages in minority and substitute teachers and in the areas of math, science, computer science, special education and foreign languages. Like other states, Kentucky does have some loan and scholarship programs for training and retraining. Primary emphasis appears to be on "stop-gap" methods, such as emergency certification, teaching "out-of-field" and over-sized classes. Sophisticated supply/demand projections systems are costly and highly volatile. However, no consolidation and coordination is currently underway to gather existing information or identify potentially available data which could provide more indications of future problem areas. Recommendations are made that the DOE, with the CHE and the Kentucky Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (KOICC), compile available relevant data into a centralized data base; the DOE, with the CHE and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority (KHEAA), produce an information pamphlet for students concerning teacher supply and demand needs and available financial assistance; and the DOE, the CHE and the KHEAA study the current and future supply and demand situation, existing efforts to deal with it and alternative approaches.

State regulation of the teaching profession covers all areas, from training through revocation of licenses. Coordination with higher education is only through ex officio membership at the policy board levels and through the presence of a wide variety of professional representatives at the advisory level. Proposals have been made for more responsibility of the teaching profession itself in its control and governance. In addition to the process being solely governed by the profession, changes in the Council on Teacher Education (CTEC), the advisory board, could increase teacher representation and influence. A recommendation is made that the CHE advise the SBE and the Superintendent concerning university resources prior to approving any changes in certification and endorsement requirements affecting university programs.

Four additional recommendations were proposed and adopted by the Committee upon final consideration of this report on May 1, 1989. These recommendations are that the General Assembly and the SBE should develop a pilot program for Professional Development Centers; the teaching profession should be governed by a professional standards board; the SBE should be required to promulgate regulations governing the use of part-time specialized instructors; and the SBE, the CHE, and the CTEC should jointly review all existing certification categories for teachers and other school personnel.

For questions or further information please contact Joseph Fiala, Assistant Director, Office for Program Review and Investigations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....	i
TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
SUMMARY.....	xi
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. KENTUCKY'S CERTIFICATION PROCESS.....	3
Requirements for Becoming a Teacher.....	3
Kentucky Requires 2.5 G.P.A. and Minimum Competency Testing.....	3
Kentucky's Teachers are Prepared Under Four-year Curriculum.....	5
A Beginning Teacher Internship Program Was Implemented on January 1, 1985.....	8
Kentucky's Standards are Endorsed by Teachers and Validated by the Performance of Beginning Teachers.....	8
Certifications and Endorsements.....	9
Kentucky Has a Large Number of Highly Specialized Certificates and Endorsements.....	10
Many States Are Moving From Broad to More Specific Certification.....	11
More Rigorous Justification for New Categories Has Been Adopted.....	11
Prescribed Curriculum Vs. Competency-Based Certification.....	12
Kentucky Prescribes the Content of Courses in Teacher Preparation.....	12
The Competency-Based Approach to Certification is Less Restrictive.....	13
The CTEC is Moving in the Direction of Specifying Competencies.....	13
Kentucky's Restrictive Approach Has Flexibility.....	14
Many States Are Developing Alternative Certification Programs.....	14
III. RECERTIFICATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMPETENCY.....	17
Fifth-year Academic Requirements.....	17
Requiring a Fifth-year Academic Program Does Not Ensure Continued Competency.....	18
Academic Credits Could Be Guided by Performance Evaluations and Growth Plans.....	19
In-Service.....	20
The DOE Has Statutory Responsibility to Establish, Direct and Maintain a Statewide In-Service Program.....	21
In-Service May Benefit the District More Than It Benefits Teachers.....	23

Kentucky Teacher's Views on In-Service	24
State and Profession Strategies for Professional Development.....	27
Professional Development Centers Enhance Teachers'	
Involvement in Their Pursuit of Professional Development.....	27
The Professional Development Team Approach Maximizes	
Opportunities For Professional Interaction Among Teachers.....	29
The Professional Development Network Approach Relies on	
University Faculty to Deliver Professional Training.....	29
Centers of Excellence Offer Opportunities to Establish	
Professional Development Alternatives.....	30
Two Types of Teacher Institutes Are Available In the State.....	30
Other States Are Trying Either More Flexible Approaches or	
Those Based on Performance Needs.....	30
Many Other Professions Allow Individualized Professional Development....	31
IV. THE COMPENSATION/PERFORMANCE LINK.....	33
Performance/Compensation Link in Other States.....	33
Pay-for-Performance Programs Seek to Recognize	
and Reward High Achievement.....	33
Teacher Classification Schemes Tie Ability and Compensation.....	34
Teacher Compensation Can Involve Non-Monetary Rewards.....	35
Compensation/Performance Link in Kentucky.....	36
Kentucky Compensates Teachers for Professional Development	
Activities and Tenure.....	36
Kentucky Has Experimented with Performance-Based Pay.....	37
Kentucky Teachers' Views on Linking Compensation and Performance.....	39
V. TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND.....	41
National and State Teacher Needs.....	41
National Statistics on Teacher Shortages are Debatable.....	41
Stricter Teacher Certification and Lower Class Sizes May Have	
Contributed to Problem.....	44
Shortages in Kentucky Are Reported in Rural Areas, Certain	
Subjects, and among Substitute and Minority Teachers.....	44
Countering Supply and Demand Problems.....	46
"Stop-gap" Methods Include Emergency Certificates,	
"Out-of-field" Teachers and Over-sized Classes.....	46
Alternative Certification Programs Can Reduce Teacher	
Shortages and Maintain Quality.....	47

Kentucky Offers Scholarships or “Forgivable Loans” to Increase the Supply of New Teachers.....	47
Kentucky’s Beginning Internship Program May Reduce New Teacher Drop-out Rates.....	48
Monitoring Kentucky’s Supply and Demand.....	48
Conducting Supply and Demand Studies Is Costly and Tenuous.....	49
Kentucky Could Benefit from Using Existing Data and Resources	49
VI. THE EVALUATION OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS.....	51
Existing Evaluations of Kentucky Teacher Preparation Programs	51
CHE Reviews, Which Stress Program Need/Demand, Have Resulted in a Few Voluntary Program Terminations.....	51
State Board of Education (SBE) and National Organization Accreditation Reviews Are the Primary Means of Ensuring Quality.....	52
Kentucky Now Evaluates the Classroom Performance of First-year Teachers.....	54
No Statewide Performance Measurement System Exists but Some Institutions Conduct Their Own Studies.....	56
Potential Performance Measures for Program Approval.....	58
Nine Southern States Are Moving Toward Using Performance Measures For Program Approval.....	58
Performance Indicators Currently Available in Kentucky May Not Be Suitable for Program Approval.....	59
Strengthening the Program Approval Process.....	60
Meaningful Accreditation Revisions Should Be Based, in Part, on Performance Data.....	60
State Accreditation Reviews Should Be Kept Strong.....	60
VII. GOVERNANCE OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION.....	63
Agency Roles and Responsibility.....	63
The State Board of Education Has Final Authority for Most Matters Concerning Certification.....	63
The CTEC Has the Most Influential Role Regarding Teacher Preparation and Certification.....	64
The Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Role is More Administrative Than Policy Oriented.....	66
The Council on Higher Education’s Role Is Not Specific to Teacher Education.....	66

Coordination of Roles and Responsibilities.....	66
Systemwide Delivery of Teacher Education Is Being Reviewed in Other States.....	66
Collaboration Between Higher Education and Elementary and Secondary Education Is Improving in Kentucky.....	67
Alternatives to the Governance Structure.....	68
Some States Have Established Teacher Standards Boards to Increase Self-Governance.....	69
Kentucky Has Several Options for Increasing Teacher Governance of the Profession.....	70
VIII. COMMITTEE ACTION.....	71

APPENDICES

A. Results of Survey of Teachers on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers.....	73
B. Results of Survey of Kentucky Administrators on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers.....	83
C. Requirements for Baccalaureate Degree in Kentucky.....	95
D. Basic Requirements for Certification and Recertification.....	96
E. Definitions of Certification Components.....	97
F. Problems with Supply and Demand Projections.....	99
G. Standards Boards with Major Teacher Representation.....	103
H. Program Review and Investigations Committee Kentucky's Teacher Preparation System Recommendation Worksheet.....	108

LIST OF TABLES

1. Comparison of Cutoff Scores for States Using NTE Core Battery 1989.....	5
2. Components of Teacher Preparation Curriculum in Kentucky	6
3. Alternate Preparation/Certification Program - Support vs. Oppose Restrict Areas to Critical Teacher Shortage.....	16
4. Administrator's and Teacher's Views on Master's Programs Effectiveness Mean Scores.....	19
5. Minimum Continuing Education in Other Professions.....	32
6. Teacher Responses to Performance-based Compensation.....	39
7. Past and Projected Trends in Estimated Demand for Classroom Teachers in Elementary/Secondary Schools and Estimated Supply of New Teacher Graduates.....	43
8. Areas of Teacher Shortage.....	45
9. Kentucky Accreditation of Teacher Education Institutions.....	55
10. Evaluation Ratings of NCATE Standards 6.1 and 6.2 (1979 - 1988).....	57

KENTUCKY'S TEACHER PREPARATION SYSTEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHAPTER II

Kentucky's requirements for certification have been upgraded in the past decade and parallel the requirements of other states. KRS 161 and related administrative regulations require that students have a minimum 2.5 GPA and pass a basic skills test for admission to a teacher preparation program. Teacher candidates must also exhibit computer literacy, pass the National Teacher Exams (NTE), and complete an internship.

Kentucky has a large number of highly specialized certificates and endorsements. On the one hand, specialization provides added assurance that teachers are adequately trained in their certified areas. On the other hand, it restricts them from teaching other subjects related to their area of certification and can exacerbate supply and demand problems. New administrative regulations provide guidelines for curtailing the proliferation of new certification categories programs. Despite the concerns voiced by a number of educators in Kentucky, many states appear to be moving from broad certification structures to more highly specialized ones.

The State Board of Education prescribes the content of courses in Kentucky's teacher preparation programs. Some educators would prefer a less restrictive, competency-based approach to certification. In this approach certification requirements outlined by the state authority take the form of "competencies" or segments of knowledge and training deemed essential for effective teaching. Colleges of education are free to offer whatever courses they feel are needed, provided they can demonstrate that the graduates have mastered the list of established competencies. If a teacher candidate demonstrates proficiency in these competencies, certification is issued by the state authority. Six states in the South are using some degree of competency-based certification. Kentucky also appears to be moving in that direction.

Kentucky's highly prescribed approach has some flexibility. Administrative regulations allow teacher candidates to bypass certain curriculum requirements by demonstrating proficiency. Furthermore, the CTEC has approved administrative regulations for alternative certification programs to be submitted to the State Board of Education. These programs would allow qualified individuals, who lack education training, to become teachers after completing an abbreviated course of study in professional education courses and an intensive working internship.

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Use of Competencies for Coursework

The State Board of Education should encourage education institutions to use proficiency tests, previous education and unusual experience as permitted in 704 KAR 20:030 and 704 KAR 15:040 more frequently in order to permit qualified individuals to obtain endorsements and certifications more expeditiously.

CHAPTER III

The recertification process ensures that Kentucky's teachers engage in professional

development activities. The key components of continuing education are enrollment in graduate courses, in-service, and on-the-job experience. The recertification of teachers occurs on a five-year cycle. During the first ten years, teachers are required to complete a planned fifth-year program of course work (i.e., a master's degree or its equivalent). The effectiveness of the planned fifth-year program would be enhanced by the use of performance evaluations and growth plans. After the tenth year, recertification is based upon in-service and three years of teaching. The sudden decline in continuing education requirements after the tenth year may be a cause for concern.

The Department of Education has the statutory responsibility to establish, direct, and maintain the statewide in-service program. It is, however, the responsibility of local school districts to assess in-service needs, plan activities, and ultimately deliver the programs. Consequently, in-service programs vary from district to district.

The purpose of in-service, as defined in the state regulations, is to meet school system needs. However, teachers indicate a preference for in-service that allows for more individualized professional development. According to the results of a statewide survey conducted by Program Review, teachers want in-service programs to improve knowledge of their specialty areas, improve their teaching skills, and teach them effective techniques for classroom management. "Flexible in-service," available in some school districts, allows teachers to pursue individual goals, but these in-service programs are costly.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Planned Fifth-Year Program

The State Board of Education should modify 704 KAR 20:020 to have the following teacher assessments, which are relevant at the time, considered in an advisory way when developing the "approved plan" leading to a master's degree or equivalent fifth-year program:

- **The final report of the teacher's internship committee;**
- **Objective(s) of the teacher's district evaluation growth plan; and**
- **Written observations made by the teacher's district supervisor/evaluator.**

RECOMMENDATION 3: Survey of Local District In-service Needs

The SBE should modify 704 KAR 3:035 to ensure that all teachers in local school districts are surveyed or have an opportunity to make suggestions as to the content and design of local in-service programs.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Cost and Effectiveness Study of In-service Day

The Department of Education should study the cost and effectiveness of requiring that a portion of the local district in-service programs be based upon individual teacher needs either by:

- **devoting one of the four current in-service days to flexible individual professional development; or**

- adding one additional day of in-service to the calendar year for individual professional development.

CHAPTER IV

Kentucky compensates teachers for professional development activities and tenure via the ranking system. The ranking system is an administrative tool for scheduling salaries, and is based on academic credits and years of experience. In recent years, there has been a great deal of discussion about implementing an alternative compensation plan. The underlying theme of most alternative compensation plans is that teachers should be rewarded on the basis of performance instead of degrees and longevity. Incentive programs (e.g., pay-for-performance, career ladder, master teacher) require some type of performance appraisal to identify and reward teachers for outstanding performance. Most incentive plans reward teachers with merit pay, bonuses or awards. However, non-monetary incentives, such as social recognition and opportunities for enhanced professional development, have also been suggested.

The “career ladder” and the “bonus pay plan,” two experiments with performance-based compensation components, were never implemented on an on-going basis in Kentucky. The evaluative instrument developed under the career ladder program did show some promise as a means of identifying outstanding teachers. The performance mechanism from the bonus pay plan is still in place. According to a survey undertaken by Program Review, most teachers believe that performance-based compensation systems are hard to manage and generally based on subjective or questionable assessments. Teachers favor alternative programs that promote cooperation, such as peer coaching or peer support programs; they do not favor performance-based programs that stratify the workforce.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Continue Research on Alternative Compensation

The General Assembly and the SBE should continue to monitor research on alternative teacher compensation systems which are based on demonstrated professional ability.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Standardize Teacher Evaluation Process

The SBE should incorporate a review of the teacher evaluation plan mandated in 704 KAR 3:345, and its application, into the accreditation process as a means of improving teacher confidence in the impartiality and equity of the process.

CHAPTER V

Several nationwide studies suggest that teacher shortages may develop within the next few years. With the onset of the so-called “baby boomlet,” the demand for elementary and secondary teachers is expected to rise in the 1990s. Several factors have exacerbated the supply and demand situation: a diminishing supply of students majoring in education, expanded employment opportunities for women and minorities, and policy initiatives aimed at increasing the quality of education.

In Kentucky, shortages have been reported in the areas of special education, mathematics, science, computer science and foreign languages; supply problems also exist for substitute and minority teachers. Some evidence suggests that the rural areas of the state are experiencing the greatest problems in meeting the demand for teachers.

In the past five years, most state legislatures or state boards of education have initiated programs to expand the supply of teachers. Monetary incentives, such as pay increases or minimum salary levels, have been implemented by most states. Scholarships and “forgivable loan programs” have also been established in an effort to attract qualified students. Finally, a number of states are implementing alternative certification programs to provide individuals who lack education training with the resources to become competent teachers.

Projecting the number of teachers the country needs is a difficult undertaking. Estimates are frequently imprecise and are based upon a number of questionable parameters. Furthermore, conducting supply and demand studies is costly and time consuming. While formal supply and demand projections may not be feasible, Kentucky could probably benefit from compiling relevant information into a supply and demand data base.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Establish a Centralized Data Base

The Department of Education, with the assistance of the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Occupational Information Coordinating Council, should compile available supply and demand related information into one centralized data base.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Report Current Employment Trends

The Department of Education, with the assistance of the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority, should publish and disseminate an annual report detailing the current employment trends of graduates from the state’s teacher preparation institutions and information on available financial assistance for students who wish to pursue a career in education. Each teacher preparation institution should provide a current copy of this report to students entering a preparation program.

RECOMMENDATION 9: Study Areas of Critical Shortage

The Department of Education, the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority should study teacher supply and demand in the Commonwealth. The study should focus on how the state is currently dealing with shortages in foreign languages, mathematics, science, special education, and computer science. Furthermore, the study should examine the problems of recruiting minority teachers. Strategies for dealing with critical shortages in these areas should also be addressed. Prior to the 1990 session of the General Assembly, the Department of Education should report its findings to the Education Committee.

CHAPTER VI

Teacher education programs in the state are evaluated every five years by both the Council on Higher Education (CHE) and the State Board of Education (SBE). The CHE evaluation addresses the viability of all academic programs in the state, including teacher preparation programs. The SBE reviews are designed to ensure compliance with teacher competency standards, certification requirements, and the standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

The rigor of the SBE's reviews has come under criticism. Four deans interviewed by Program Review staff claimed that the state accreditation visits (conducted without the assistance of NCATE) were "soft." Officials in the DOE's Division of Certification indicated that budget cutbacks and staff losses in the Division weakened the review process in the early to mid-1980s. Prior to new initiatives by the DOE and SBE in 1986, some programs had not been reviewed for at least 8 years. Beginning in 1986, the SBE put new emphasis on improving the accreditation and program reviews.

Recently, several states have started to use "performance evaluations" to judge the quality of teacher preparation programs. These evaluations use outcome measures, such as passing rates on certification exams and on-the-job evaluations, to approve programs. Currently, the performance of students and new teachers is not being used to accredit institutions or approve programs in Kentucky. To ensure the development and maintenance of program quality, it is critical to conduct meaningful accreditation reviews based, in part, on the performance of program graduates.

RECOMMENDATION 10: Continue Strengthening SBE's Accreditation Process

The State Board of Education should continue its efforts to strengthen the existing accreditation and program approval process. The five-year cycle of accreditation visits should be maintained.

RECOMMENDATION 11: Coordinate CHE and SBE Program Reviews

The State Board of Education and the Council on Higher Education should coordinate their reviews of teacher preparation programs in an effort to reduce the burden placed on colleges and universities.

RECOMMENDATION 12: Develop Valid Outcome Measures for Program Approval

The State Board of Education should have the Department of Education incorporate existing performance indicators in the accreditation process and, with the assistance of the CHE, develop more valid outcome measures for inclusion in the next 5-year program accreditation cycle.

CHAPTER VII

The state regulates the teaching profession through certification and revocation of licensure and through the approval of teacher preparation programs. Governance responsibilities are delegated among four state entities. The State Board of Education (SBE) has final authority for most matters concerning teacher preparation and certification. The Council on Teacher Education and Certification (CTEC), a 33-member advisory group to the SBE, probably has the most influential role in the governance structure. The Superintendent of Public Instruction's role is more administrative than policy oriented. And the Council on Higher Education (CHE) has program approval responsibilities that include, but are not specific to, teacher education programs.

Teacher education is regulated through the program approval processes of two

state agencies. Accordingly, communication and collaboration between the two is essential to improved delivery of teacher education in Kentucky. In several states boards of higher education and elementary/secondary education are joining forces to plan and coordinate systemwide delivery of higher education. Collaboration between the CHE and the SBE is more evident now than in the past, especially in areas of common interest. However, the CHE should have some input in the development of new certification categories and program requirements which may have serious budget implications for the colleges of education.

Some critics charge that the CTEC, an advisory body composed of various educational professionals, does not adequately represent the needs of the state's teachers. These individuals feel that the teaching profession should be self-governed. The state has several options available for increasing the role of teachers in the governance structure.

RECOMMENDATION 13: SBE and CHE Coordination

The State Board of Education should amend 704 KAR 20:005 to require that "determination of sufficient demand for training for a position" be made in consideration with a statement from the Executive Director of the Council on Higher Education on resources available for establishment of a new program or programs in teacher education colleges.

CHAPTER VIII

The Program Review and Investigations Committee adopted the staff draft report at the May 1, 1989 committee meeting. At that time, four additional recommendations were proposed by Committee members and adopted by the Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 14: Professional Development Centers

The General Assembly should fund, and the State Board of Education should develop and administer a pilot program to establish three professional development centers for a three year period. The regional professional development centers would provide training programs that would allow teachers to complete the in-service requirements for recertification, and would also establish a level of training programs suitable as an option to the traditional Master's or Fifth-year Program. An independent evaluation should be part of the program. An evaluation report should be forwarded to the General Assembly within six months of the program's end.

The plan and budget proposal developed by the State Board of Education should be submitted to the Interim Joint Committee on Education prior to the 1990 Regular Session of the General Assembly.

RECOMMENDATION 15: Professional Standards Board

A new Section of KRS Chapter 161 should be established to create a professional standards board responsible for the issuance, suspension, renewal and revocation of certificates for Kentucky teachers and regulation of the Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship Program. The professional standards board should be an autonomous body with members appointed by the Governor. The membership should

be composed predominantly of teachers, with representation from the following: school administrators, teacher educators, higher education representatives and lay representation.

RECOMMENDATION 16: Part-time Specialized Instructors

A new section of KRS Chapter 161 should be created requiring the State Board of Education to establish regulations governing the qualifications and the utilization of persons from other professions with demonstrated expertise in their respective areas of education, training or professional experience. These regulations should specify the minimum essential competencies which must be demonstrated by any person seeking certification as a part-time instructor of subjects related to his or her areas of expertise and should establish and require competency tests if deemed necessary.

Holders of this certificate should be employed on an annual contract basis and not be eligible for continuing service status or for retirement provisions.

Local school boards could contract with such certificated instructors for part-time services on an hourly, daily or other periodic basis as best meets the needs of the board.

RECOMMENDATION 17: Review of Certification Categories

The State Board of Education, the Council on Higher Education, and the Council on Teacher Education and Certification should establish a task force composed of members selected from each body to review all existing specialized certification categories for teachers and other school personnel. The membership should also include the Superintendent of Public Instruction. On or before November 1, 1989, the task force should submit a report to the Stte Board, the Council on Teacher Education and Certification and the Legislative Research Commission regarding the continuation, discontinuation or combination of specific certification categories.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

House Joint Resolution 81, adopted by the 1988 General Assembly, mandated a study of the Commonwealth's system of preparing teachers to be conducted by the Program Review and Investigations Committee. The study addressed several facets of the education profession, including the requirements for initial certification and continuing education, continuing education requirements, experimental alternatives to the traditional Rank I and Rank II requirements, the governance of the teaching profession, the feasibility of annual performance evaluations, and an assessment of the supply and demand for teachers.

The methodology used in this study consisted of several detailed components:

- A statutory search and an analysis of the Kentucky Administrative Regulations;
- A review of recent studies of teacher education and reform conducted nationally and in Kentucky;
- A series of interviews conducted with officials from the Department of Education, State Board of Education, Education and Humanities Cabinet, Council on Higher Education, nine deans of public and private colleges of education in the Commonwealth; and representatives of teacher, administrator and university organizations;
- A survey of 600 public school administrators detailing their attitudes toward and perceptions of the undergraduate education curriculum, continuing education requirements, teacher competency, and teacher supply and demand, and other relevant issues;
- A survey of 617 public school teachers eliciting their opinions on teacher compensation systems, in-service programs, continuing education requirements, undergraduate education curriculum, and other relevant issues;
- A review of the state/NCATE accreditation reports for all institutions offering teacher preparation programs;
- Observance of several meetings of the Kentucky Council on Teacher Education and Certification, the Committee on Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), Training Seminar for Planning In-service Programs for In-service Education Directors (IEDs), Consortium on Knowledge Base for the Kentucky Beginning Internship Program, and the Core Curriculum Committee;
- Attendance at an NCATE and DOE Board of Examiners Training Seminar on evaluation of teacher preparation programs; and
- A survey of the state's higher education institutions to determine curriculum requirements for a baccalaureate degree in teacher preparation at each institution.

Chapter II sets forth requirements for becoming a teacher, describes Kentucky's highly specialized certification and endorsement system and discusses competency-based certification. Chapter III delineates the continuing education requirements for recertification. Chapter IV presents alternatives to Kentucky's teacher compensation system. Chapter V analyzes teacher shortages at the national and state level and presents policy initiatives for dealing with shortages. Chapter VI outlines the evaluation process of teacher education programs. Chapter VII discusses the roles and responsibilities in state regulation of teacher education. And Chapter VIII delineates final action on the report and the recommendations by the Program Review and Investigations Committee.

CHAPTER II

KENTUCKY'S CERTIFICATION PROCESS

In the early 1980s, Kentucky's standards for initial teacher preparation and certification were increased to ensure that minimum levels of competency were being met. This general upgrading of the system has been viewed favorably by most of those concerned. Kentucky's standards are similar to those in other states; however, state standards differ in certain areas. At the national and local level, there are divergent opinions regarding such approaches as four-year versus five-year certification programs; curriculum content; competency-based versus curriculum-based certification; and the number and specificity of certification categories and endorsements to be offered.

Requirements for Becoming a Teacher

KRS 161.030 prescribes the basic teacher certification requirements. These include completion of a prescribed curriculum at an approved college or university, successful completion of a basic skills test, and successful completion of a one-year beginning teacher's internship. Additional requirements include: computer literacy (704 KAR 20:3400), maintenance of a minimum grade point average overall and within specialty areas (704 KAR 20:005 (1) by reference), and others relating to curriculum.

Kentucky's reforms in teacher preparation have been accepted nationally and locally. The reforms have support among teachers, administrators, study groups and education associations. In striving to offer accountability in teacher education, most states have developed new policy initiatives. Many states have incorporated reforms similar to those enacted in Kentucky, or they are moving in that direction.

Kentucky Requires 2.5 G.P.A. and Minimum Competency Testing

Under Kentucky's more rigorous teacher preparation program, candidates must pass higher admission standards, maintain a 2.5 grade point average (G.P.A.), and pass minimum competency examinations before being certified.

Admission standards for teacher preparation programs began increasing in 1983. Kentucky implemented basic skills testing and established a 2.0 G.P.A. as admission requirements for teacher preparation programs in 1983. To complete the basic skills test requirement, a teacher education candidate must either score a 12.5 on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), or score 19 on the American College Test (ACT) or an equivalent test including reading, writing, and math skills. In 1983, the G.P.A. admission standard for entry was set at 2.0. It was subsequently raised to 2.25, and most recently raised to 2.5 in July, 1987. According to a U.S. Department of Education publication, "What's Happening in Teacher Testing," (1987), 27 states require a basic skills examination prior to admission into a teacher preparation program. A Council of State Governments publication indicated that most states require a 2.5 G.P.A. or better for admission to teacher preparation programs.

Maintenance of the G.P.A. is required for program completion. In Kentucky, teacher preparation candidates must maintain a 2.5 G.P.A. in overall coursework, academic specialty area, and professional education courses.

Testing prior to certification was established in 1984. In 1984, the General Assembly mandated testing for teacher candidates prior to certification. According to KRS 161.030(4), these written "tests shall measure those concepts, ideas and facts which are being taught in teacher education programs in Kentucky." At the beginning of 1987, there were 26 states requiring testing before certification was awarded. Now there are at least 44. Kentucky and 21 other states use the National Teacher Examinations (NTE) to fulfill this requirement. The NTE battery is composed of tests on general knowledge, communication skills, professional skills and an appropriate specialty test.

States using the NTE have set different performance standards for certification. Initially, the cutoff score was set at a variable range, from the fourth to the eleventh percentile. On January 1, 1989, the cutoff scores were raised to the 15th percentile for all sections.

Table 1 presents the current cutoff scores for 13 states which use all or part of the NTE core battery for certification purposes. Other states use the NTE exams for certification, but have not reported their cutoff scores to the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). On the "general knowledge" component, state cutoff scores range from 631 to 649, and the mean cutoff is 643.8. Kentucky's cutoff score on this component is 643. On the "communication skills" component, state cutoff scores range from 636 to 653, and the mean cutoff is 647.8. Kentucky's cutoff score for the communication skills component is 646. Finally, state cutoff scores on the "professional knowledge" component range from 630 to 648, and the mean cutoff is 643.5. On the professional knowledge portion of the exam, Kentucky's cutoff score is 644. Thus, Kentucky's cutoff scores are just below the mean on the general knowledge and communication skills components. On the professional knowledge portion of the NTE, Kentucky's cutoff score is a half of a point above the mean cutoff score.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF CUTOFF SCORES FOR STATES
USING NTE CORE BATTERY
1989

STATE	CUTOFF SCORE		
	GEN. KNOWLEDGE	COMMUN. SKILLS	PROF. KNOWLEDGE
Hawaii*	647	651	648
Indiana*	647	653	646
Kansas			642
Kentucky	643	646	644
Louisiana	644	645	645
Mississippi	639	644	642
Montana*	644	648	648
New Jersey*	644		
New Mexico	645	644	630
New York	649	650	646
North Carolina	631	636	644
Rhode Island*	649	657	648
Tennessee	649	651	643
Virginia	639	649	639

* Updated scores have not been reported.

SOURCE: Reported in telephone interview with Lynn Cornett, SREB, from recently collected data.

Kentucky's Teachers Are Prepared Under a Four-year Curriculum

Although Kentucky's program has been strengthened in the last few years, there is still a debate among colleges from across the state and within the region as to how teachers should be prepared.

The baccalaureate degree curriculum has undergone revision in the last few years. The current curriculum components include general education, professional education (including student teaching), academic specialization, related studies and electives. Appendix D outlines these requirements. Professional education requirements, including twelve weeks of student teaching, were established when the middle level certification (grades 5-8) curriculum was instituted. Simultaneously, the professional education requirements were increased for early elementary certifications (grades K-4) and specialty area depth was established for both levels:

- K-4 - 21-hour academic specialization; and

- 5-8 - two fields (specialty areas) of 24 hours each.

The four-year curriculum in Kentucky varies from college to college. The basic issue relating to the four-year degree is the amount of emphasis which should be placed on liberal arts or general education. The Council on Teacher Education and Certification (CTEC) prescribes the minimum number of hours required in four components, general education, professional education, related studies and academic specialization. Table 2 list the credit requirements for each component of the teacher preparation curriculum at the three teaching certification levels.

TABLE 2

Components of Teacher Preparation Curriculum in Kentucky

Component	K-4	5-8	9-12*
Gen. Educ.	45	45	45
Prof. Educ.**	27	18	13
Rel. Stud.	18	0	0
Acad. Spec.	21	24	30 - Major
		24	24 - Minor

Key:

* Requirements for major in English.

** Coursework only, without student teaching.

Source: Department of Education

(Definitions of the components and a table showing the required hours for each are contained in Appendix C and Appendix D.) Even with these constraints, course requirements for teacher preparation programs vary at the State's colleges and universities.

In a review of transcripts from across the region, an SREB report showed a wide range of course requirements at the teacher preparation institutions. The average number of general education courses taken by elementary majors amounted to 69.3 semester hours. The Program Review and Investigations staff surveyed the colleges and universities offering teacher preparation programs in this state. They found great variability, across institutions, in the number of credit hours required for the different components. For instance, the general education credit hour requirements ranged from 31 to 73 hours for elementary majors, 30 to 73 hours for middle level majors, and 16 to 39 hours for secondary majors. An absolute comparison of the course requirements among the teacher education programs is not really possible without an analysis of course content. Institutions note that some of the related subject requirements overlap the general education requirements, and the categories used vary among institutions. The range of total hours required for a degree

can be compared. This runs from 128 to 152 credit hours. Based on State Board of Education (SBE) program reviews, all are considered in compliance with SBE requirements.

The SREB transcript analysis indicated that professional education courses at the institutions ranged from 21 to 53 semester hours for elementary majors and from 16 to 29 semester hours for secondary majors. These figures do not include student teaching requirements in the area of professional education courses. The Program Review and Investigations' survey of state institutions found that the number of credit hours ranged from 15 to 46 for elementary majors, 15 to 42 for middle level majors, and 14 to 38 for secondary majors. One institution which reported fewer semester hours than the SBE requirement explained that the SBE may have included "support courses" not listed on the survey in the total required hours. In addition, the institution's footnotes indicate that course requirements from one component may be substituted so that a student fulfills the SBE requirements. (Appendix C shows the ranges.)

For some time, all states have required a baccalaureate degree for entry into the profession. Teacher education curricula generally require the following elements:

- General education courses - 24 to 54 hours,
- Concentration certification - 22 to 40 hours,
- Professional education courses - 18 to 36 hours,
- Classroom observation - 45 to 150 hours and/or student teaching - at least 12 weeks;
- Demonstrations in written and oral communication and observation by faculty members during student teaching.

According to an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 20, 1988, at least 32 states have recently revised their curriculum for teacher candidates. Some states now require students to major in an academic subject, obtain a liberal arts or science degree, and take a limited number of pedagogy (teaching method) courses instead of obtaining an undergraduate degree in education. Some states, such as Kentucky and Iowa, have increased professional education requirements and specialty area courses. All but three states require some degree of student teaching.

The fifth-year program is at the experimental stage in Kentucky. The five-year programs proposed by the Carnegie report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986), and the Holmes Group report, *Tomorrow's Teachers* (1986), support a strong baccalaureate degree curriculum in arts and sciences during the first four years of preparation. The professional education component would be acquired in the fifth year.

House Joint Resolution 81 of the 1988 General Assembly called for the SBE, with assistance of the CTEC, to promulgate administrative regulations for a Master of Arts in Teaching Degree by July 1, 1989. In establishing the Master of Arts in Teaching

Committee (MAT), the CTEC charged the committee with:

the development of a proposal for consideration by the Council on Teacher Education and Certification for a MAT degree to include 'rigorous graduate level study of the philosophy and practice of teaching; and

the consideration of the Alternative Certification proposal' and presentation of recommendations to the Council 'that include reference to and resolution of the Alternative Certification proposal and concerns.'

The Committee has met several times and anticipates presenting a draft of its plan to the CTEC at its February 1989 meeting and making a formal presentation at the April 1989 meeting.

A Beginning Teacher Internship Program Was Implemented On January 1, 1985

During the one-year internship program outlined in KRS 161.030 (7-10), the performance of a newly certified teacher is closely monitored by a school principal, a resource teacher and a teacher educator or instructional supervisor. The resource teacher is charged with providing assistance to the teacher intern. The three-member committee determines the intern's progress by observing his classroom performance, reviewing the intern's teaching materials, and assessing the intern's responses to committee recommendations. Interns are presently critiqued by the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS), a measurement system based upon the evaluation of competencies identified in a large body of research on effective teaching. Kentucky has developed and validated its own measurement instrument, scheduled to be implemented statewide by September, 1989.

Since its inception, the program has prepared 3,439 interns. Currently, 1640 beginning teachers are serving as interns, bringing the anticipated total of interns to nearly 5,000 in four years. An internship or a residency period for beginning teachers is required in twelve states. Several other states are now considering this option. Seven other states offer some other types of support or assistance programs for beginning teachers.

Kentucky's Standards Are Endorsed by Teachers and Validated by the Performance of Beginning Teachers

The reforms in Kentucky's teacher preparation program are relatively new. Accordingly, a long-term assessment is not possible. Nevertheless, there are measures that suggest that the program has real value.

First, these standards have the general approval of education professionals. In the Program Review and Investigations' surveys, teachers and administrators were asked to evaluate the minimum standards for admission to a teacher preparation program:

- Over 94% of teachers and administrators agreed that minimum standards are "a good idea";

- 83% of the administrators said that the 2.5 G.P.A. requirement and the basic skills test are “somewhat effective” or “effective” at screening out candidates who do not have the potential to become good teachers.

Additional findings of the survey indicate that:

- Almost two-thirds of the teachers and administrators agree that the NTE cut-off score should be kept at the current level (the 15th ● ile);
- Slightly more than one-third of the teachers and administrators favor raising the cut-off scores to permit fewer students to pass; and
- There is almost no support for lowering the cut-off scores.

The Program Review and Investigations survey also found that 91.6 % of the administrators and 82.5% of the teachers rated Kentucky’s internship program as either “somewhat effective” or “effective.”

Second, teacher candidates have scored well on two performance measures. When teacher candidates took the NTE in 1987, for the second year in a row, the mean score of students from fifteen Kentucky schools was slightly better than the national mean in all three core battery tests. They equaled or exceeded the national mean score in all specialty tests except French, School Media Specialist, Spanish and Speech Communications. In some of these areas, only a few examinees took the tests. Consequently, fair and adequate comparisons are not possible. In addition, Kentucky’s interns have a successful completion rate of 98% annually. Of the 3,400 participants in the beginning teacher internship program, only thirty have not become licensed teachers.

Finally, according to DOE staff, Kentucky beginning teachers are recruited on a regular basis by other states, particularly Florida, Montana, Georgia and Texas. The end product of Kentucky’s teacher preparation system is well-accepted by other states, including those which have recently upgraded their own programs. In keeping with the recruiting of state-educated teachers, Kentucky has adopted the “Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel,” which outlines a system of recognition of teacher qualifications across state lines. Twenty-eight other states and two districts have agreed to accept teachers trained according to Kentucky’s current preparation standards.

Certifications and Endorsements

A 1978 DOE letter from the Division of Teacher Education and Certification to the Superintendent of Public Instruction stated that prior to 1956, there were thirteen provisional and ten standard certification categories. Since that time a significant number of certification categories have been added, the original categories have been delineated further by specialty areas, and the middle level of certification has been incorporated into teacher preparation. Currently there may be 120 or more certification categories, depending upon one’s definition. With each new certification category, additional pedagogy requirements have developed, e.g., methods courses for teaching each subject.

Kentucky Has a Large Number of Highly Specialized Certificates and Endorsements

A major area of debate revolves around the number of specific certification and endorsement categories available in Kentucky, and the required preparation for each.

There are two basic types of renewable certificates — provisional and standard. Initially, a teacher is awarded a provisional certificate for one year. Following completion of the internship, the certificate is extended for four additional years. A standard certificate is awarded for five years and is obtained by successful completion of either a master's degree or an approved, non-degree, fifth-year, 32 semester-hour program of preparation.

Certification for teachers is now granted at three teaching levels: early elementary (K-4), middle (5-8), and high school (9-12), and it is also available in areas such as music or physical education for K-12. These certificate levels now apply to all persons seeking certification after September 1, 1988. The middle level teacher preparation program began in 1974 as an experimental program under the auspices of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. It was finally adopted by the SBE in 1984. Additionally, certificates are now required for teachers of exceptional children (K-12), instructional supervisors (K-12), and for various types of specialists at various grade ranges.

Endorsements are offered at all certification levels and in all teaching fields. Endorsements, or "extending the validity," allow a teacher certified in one area to teach in another area without duplicating the educational core curriculum completed for the first certification. Special standards, unique to each teacher certification and endorsement category, vary in specific instructional methodology. Specialization, however, is most noticeable at the high school certification level and in special education areas.

Several groups have contributed to the increase in specific certifications. A legislative mandate, which bypassed the CTEC approval process in 1986, required highly specialized preparation in the master's degree requirement for the speech pathologist. It incorporated a lengthy and involved program requiring students already pursuing this degree to develop a plan to complete a fifth year.

The SBE has also prescribed new positions and special preparations. Groups with vested interest (teachers, administrators and teacher educators) have advocated new certification and endorsement categories. Professional organizations have insisted on their own program standards.

The proliferation and specificity of certificates should be monitored to ensure need. Several studies have criticized the proliferation of certificates and endorsements. The studies have recommended that the CTEC simplify the certification system by abolishing some categories, by combining others, and reviewing all categories on a cyclical basis. In the Program Review and Investigations survey, 67.6% of the administrators and 46% of the teachers "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that some of the more specialized categories should be combined into broader categories. Certificates and endorsements are necessary

to ensure that teachers are properly trained in the areas they teach; however, certificates and endorsements do limit the flexibility of teachers to teach in related areas and can exacerbate supply and demand problems. The Program Review and Investigations surveys also questioned administrators and teachers regarding the flexibility or restrictiveness of the certification system. Sixty-three percent of the administrators and 62 percent of the teachers rated the system as either “somewhat restrictive” or “restrictive.”

Many States Are Moving from Broad to More Specific Certification

NASDTEC Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States lists the states with broad certification systems and specific certification systems. The states are classified in three levels:

- Broad certification — allows certificate holder to be assigned to a position but does not specify the subject in which the holder was trained;
- Semi-broad — allows certificate holder to teach any type of subject matter within the specialized area of certification; and
- Specific authorization — allows certificate holder to teach a specific subject.

All fifty states and the District of Columbia reported broad elementary teacher authorizations. For secondary authorizations, three states reported systems with broad certification; 32 states reported systems with semi-broad authorization; and 24 states, including Kentucky, reported systems that issue specific authorizations. (Eight states reported in more than one category.) The current trend appears to be a shift to more specific authorization. Of the 21 states that have made a change in the last five years, 14 report that they moved from broad authorization to more specific authorization, and seven moved from specific to broad. Finally, an equal number of states (eleven) anticipated moving from broad to specific or vice versa within the next five years. Kentucky was among 30 states that anticipated no change. (One state reported in both categories.)

More Rigorous Justification for New Categories Has Been Adopted

The Task Force on Teacher Education and Certification proposed language for administrative regulations regarding new certification programs. Accordingly, 704 KAR 20:005 requires that “any new position” requiring a program of preparation and certification be evaluated by the following criteria:

- There must be a compelling reason for a new category and program, where no adequate alternative currently exists;
- There must be a distinctive body of knowledge (of at least twelve semester hours) for preparation;
- Pupils must have unique characteristics which require these special programs;
- There must be sufficient demand for the development of such a program at an education institution;

- The program must be cost-effective in terms of benefits to the local school districts.

Prescribed Curriculum vs. Competency-Based Certification

There are several approaches to establishing curriculum and course requirements for teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education. A prescriptive approach suggests that a state authority establish the curriculum. On the other hand, a competency-based approach requires that the institution must demonstrate that its graduates have learned specific segments of knowledge and training essential to teaching.

Kentucky Prescribes the Content of Courses in Teacher Preparation Programs

Kentucky, like most states, uses the “approved program approach” to certification. This entails periodic, stringent reviews of teacher education programs by the state education department to assess compliance with state requirements. State requirements for program approval can cover specifications on course requirements, credit hour requirements, instructional materials, and the like.

Proponents of a highly prescribed certification and endorsement curriculum argue that this system ensures that teachers will be adequately prepared. Depth in the curriculum is believed to be associated with greater knowledge on the part of teacher candidates. Increased professional education requirements are intended to correlate the best teaching concepts with the subject matter at a specific teaching level.

The prescriptive approach used in Kentucky appears to be endorsed by the statutes. KRS 161.030 (2) authorizes the SBE to issue teaching certificates to persons who have completed the “prescribed” curricula recommended by the CTEC and approved by the SBE, at an SBE approved college or university. SBE prescriptions can be as detailed as specifying the content of required courses.

To illustrate this point, 704 KAR 20:290 prescribes by reference the requirements for a Provisional Elementary Certificate. The specific authorizations outlined in the first segment of the regulation include a general statement that the 4-year baccalaureate program shall consist of four components: general education, related studies, academic emphasis and professional preparation. Later sections prescribe the courses and credit hour requirements of each component. For example,

The professional preparation component shall consist of at least 39 semester hours credit . . . shall include as a minimum: Human Growth and Development Learning Theory - 9 semester hours; Education in Society - 3 semester hours; Instructional Strategies, Methods, and Materials - 12 semester hours, etc. . . .

Later subsections prescribe the course content of the required courses in the various components. For example,

Human Growth, Development and Learning shall include: life span development; child development; theories of learning; exceptional children in the regular classroom; family diversity and its effects on learning; family crises such as death, divorce, violence, and illness

The Competency-Based Approach to Certification is Less Restrictive

Some educators would prefer a less restrictive approach, such as competency-based certification. In this approach, certification requirements outlined by the state authority take the form of lists of "competencies" or those segments of knowledge and training which are essential for teacher candidates to comprehend. Under this less prescriptive approach, colleges of education are free to offer whatever courses they feel are needed, provided they can demonstrate that the program produces graduates that are proficient in the list of established competencies. If a teacher candidate demonstrates proficiency in these competencies, certification is issued by the state authority.

SREB states, including Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, Louisiana and South Carolina, have been utilizing the competency-based approach in some form for at least ten years. North Carolina, for example, maintained the approved program model. They, however, focus more attention on defining the competencies expected of beginning teachers and insuring that institutions are maintaining the appropriate programs for their students to achieve those competencies.

Proponents of competency-based certification applaud the flexibility it gives colleges of education for innovation in the preparation of teachers. The more prescriptive approach can present staffing and other logistical problems for the universities which prevent the preparation process from proceeding in the most effective and efficient manner.

On the other hand, proponents of the prescriptive approach point out that prescribing course curriculum does bring an element of consistency to all college programs. The Program Review and Investigations' survey of teacher education colleges, however, reports that institutional requirements do vary, yet students are able to meet SBE requirements.

The CTEC is Moving in the Direction of Specifying Competencies

Although Kentucky has not adopted the competency-based approach to certification, each institution is required to identify, develop and evaluate the competencies that are considered desirable for graduates from their particular preparation program. Therefore, Kentucky may already possess some of the essential tools if it should decide to move from prescribing course content to a competency-based approach. The most significant missing elements, however, are strong evaluative instruments to measure performance. The NTE, in its present state, has limited use as a performance measure. Accordingly, the state would have to commit resources to develop a valid evaluative process.

The Core Curriculum Committee of the Council on Teacher Education and Certification has started a move toward a more competency-based approach. It will establish broad knowledge bases and competencies in professional knowledge which would be

applicable to all certification categories and endorsements. According to the CTEC minutes, “this should reduce duplication now found in coursework in the various certification programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels.”

Kentucky’s Restrictive Approach Has Flexibility

Kentucky’s highly prescriptive approach to certification is not ironclad. Administrative regulations permit some degree of flexibility through exclusions and experimental preparation programs for teachers. The broadest exclusion is contained in 704 KAR 20:030, which permits an accredited teacher education institution to

evaluate and accept competency for teacher certification purposes for any of the specific curriculum requirements when the teacher candidate can demonstrate proficiency by reason of previous education, unusual experience, or proficiency examination at a level comparable to the usual requirements in that curriculum area.

Department of Education officials report that this is a seldom used option. The primary drawbacks are the difficulties faced by the institutions in measuring proficiency and in explaining the provision to students who are not eligible under the regulation.

Flexibility is also evident in the following regulations:

- 704 KAR 20:125 offers an alternative training program to prepare certified teachers to teach in middle level classrooms, but only in school districts reorganizing to a tri-level system;
- 704 KAR 15:040 allows appropriate modifications in required laboratory experience based on a teacher candidate’s prior teaching experience; and
- 704 KAR 15:030 encourages teacher education institutions to develop and conduct “experimental, innovative, or demonstration” teacher preparation programs. Proposals, however, must be approved by the State Board of Education for initial authorization and must demonstrate a need for continuation.

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Use of Competencies for Coursework

The State Board of Education should encourage education institutions to use proficiency tests, previous education and unusual experience as permitted in 704 KAR 20:030 and 704 KAR 15:040 more frequently in order to permit qualified individuals to obtain endorsements and certifications more expeditiously.

Many States Are Developing Alternative Certification Programs

The SREB reports that alternative certification programs for teachers are available in some form in all SREB states. These programs enable non-education graduates to enter the teaching profession without having to complete a traditional undergraduate teacher preparation program. States have established alternative certification programs for several reasons. Some states faced with actual or impending teacher shortages have used the

programs as an alternative to issuing emergency certificates. Others have been motivated by a belief that alternatively prepared teachers might enrich the profession because of the varied backgrounds they would bring to the classroom.

Alternative certification proposals are being implemented in Kentucky. The State Board of Education, upon recommendation from the Council on Teacher Education and Certification, has approved a pilot program at the University of Louisville (U. of L.). Candidates were recruited in the spring of 1988, enrolled in academic classwork over the summer, and employed by the Jefferson County Public Schools as emergency teachers on a half-time basis, with supervisory support similar to the Kentucky Internship Program. The academic curriculum is designed so that each candidate may complete a Master of Arts in teaching in approximately one year (two full summer sessions and the fall and spring semester). Successful candidates would still be required to complete the Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship, but this would occur during their second year of teaching.

In addition to the U. of L. pilot program, a subcommittee of the CTEC developed draft regulations on alternative certification programs in September, 1987. They were adopted by the full Council in April, 1988. Final Regulations have not been submitted to the SBE. Under the proposed regulations, alternative programs shall require:

- eligible applicants to complete a B.A. degree, including a major or minor in a subject area; have 3 years of successful post baccalaureate job experience, and contract for employment as a half-time emergency teacher;
- students to demonstrate continuing progress, including coursework and supervised teaching;
- programs to develop expectations for student outcomes comparable to the regular program the state has approved for the institution; and
- programs to include a pre-residency component (academic), a residence year component (academic and classroom teaching), and a post-residency component (academic).

The CTEC proposes, as a matter of state policy, that alternative certification be used in preference to emergency certifications. They believe that alternative certification could serve to discourage the abuse of emergency certificates through repeated renewals.

Kentucky teachers are evenly divided in support of alternative certification; administrators' support is more varied. In the Program Review and Investigations surveys, teachers and administrators were asked if they supported or opposed alternative preparation/certification programs. Table 3 indicates that teachers were evenly divided in their support of and opposition to alternative preparation programs. Chi-square analysis revealed that support for these programs varied with the geographical region of the respondent. Alternative preparation programs received a plurality of support in central, northern, and eastern Kentucky, as well as the Louisville Metro area. A plurality of opposition to such programs was found in southern, southeastern, western, and west central Kentucky. Table 3 also indicates that alternative preparation programs receive significant

support from superintendents and significant opposition by primary school principals. Secondary school principals and instructional supervisors indicated marginal support for such programs.

Teachers and administrators who supported alternative preparation were also asked whether these programs should be restricted to areas with a critical teacher shortage. Fifty-two percent of the teachers indicated that alternative preparation programs should not be restricted to areas facing a shortage.

TABLE 3

Alternate Preparation/Certification Program
Support vs Oppose

Educator	% Support	% Oppose	% No Opinion
Teacher	40.2%	39.9%	19.9%
Superintendent	59.6	27.81	12.58
Primary Principal	38.95	43.02	18.02
Secondary Principal	52.33	37.21	33.88
Instructional Supervisor	51.91	33.88	14.21

Restrict Areas to Critical Teacher Shortage

Educator	% Support	% Oppose	% No Opinion
Teacher	(Too many missing answers to report)		
Superintendent	43.33%	48.89%	7.78%
Primary Principal	29.85	53.73	16.42
Secondary Principal	35.56	44.44 q20.00	
Instructional Supervisor	33.68	45.26	21.06

Source: LRC, Program Review and Investigations Surveys of Teachers and Administrators, 1988.

Similarly, opposition to restricting alternative preparation programs was indicated by a plurality of respondents at each administrative position: 48.9% of the superintendents, 53.7% of the primary school principals, 44.4% of the secondary principals, and 45.3% of the instructional supervisors.

CHAPTER III

RECERTIFICATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMPETENCY

The certification process provides some assurance that Kentucky's beginning teachers have achieved a "safe level" of competency. Recertification based upon continuing professional development is a means of ensuring the maintenance of these standards over time. However, there is no clear consensus regarding what is or should be involved in professional development.

A study of the Mississippi Certification process, *A Report to the Governor on Education* (1982), stated that recertification essentially should be a reaffirmation that a teacher has sustained at least the minimal level of competency required for initial certification. The study asserted that:

Either the State should require demonstrated professional development as a condition for recertification, or else recertify automatically in the absence of any affirmative action pending against the person that would otherwise disqualify him or her from teaching under relevant law.

Through recertification, Kentucky ensures that teachers engage in professional development activities. The key components of recertification in Kentucky are continuing education through enrollment in graduate courses, in-service training, and on-the-job experience. Because there is no requirement to demonstrate that these professional development activities are relevant, proof of participation is all that is required for recertification. Requirements for recertification (and therefore professional development) decline after the tenth year of teaching.

A fifth year of academic coursework is required within the first ten years for maintaining one's certification. After ten years, recertification is based upon the completion of in-service requirements and three years of teaching. The sudden decline in continuing education requirements after the tenth year is of possible concern. Certainly on-the-job experience contributes greatly to professional growth; however, the degree to which it sustains the "safe level" of competence or currency of knowledge in a field is unknown.

Fifth-year Academic Requirements

Kentucky's teachers are recertified at five-year intervals. Upon completion of the internship program, the one-year provisional certification is extended for four years. Fifteen credit hours toward a Master's degree (or equivalent) and participation in four annual in-service days are required for the first five-year recertification. By the tenth year, a teacher must have obtained the Master's degree, or the equivalent, and participated in annual in-service days for the second recertification at Rank II. Beyond Rank II, a teacher faces no requirements for continuous five-year recertifications other than the four annual in-service days and at least three years of teaching.

A teacher seeking to fulfill the state requirements for obtaining a master's degree

has five options, all in school-related preparation programs:

- Plan I completion of a master's degree, leading to a standard certificate;
- Plan II completion of a master's degree, leading to a provisional certificate renewal in professional education;
- Plan III completion of a master's degree, leading to a provisional certificate renewal in an academic subject;
- Plan IV completion of a non-degree fifth-year program of 32 semester hours, including twelve hours of graduate credit, etc., and leading to a provisional certificate renewal;
- Plan V completion of a non-degree, fifth-year program of 32 semester hours as in Plan IV but allowing twelve semester hours to be earned in continuing education units and/or professional staff development units. (This program has not been developed at Kentucky institutions.)

The first three plans culminate in a master's degree, while the last two plans are non-degree programs. According to DOE, Plan IV is used most frequently.

Requiring a Fifth-year Academic Program Does Not Ensure Continued Competency

The SREB reports in a 1984 publication, "In-Service Programs for Teachers, Issues and Actions," that the primary criticisms directed at the use of formal academic credits as the primary means of promoting professional development are that:

- Graduate courses are irrelevant to teacher's needs;
- University faculty are out-of-touch with the realities of classroom teaching; and
- Academic credits cost teachers money and considerable time.

The publication stated that the primary attributes of the more traditional approach included: more control over the quality university courses in comparison to less formalized training; and the availability of a variety of university courses around which to tailor continuing education to individual needs.

The effectiveness of the master's degree in improving one's teaching ability has also been debated. A 1988 study by the Center for Public Service at the University of Virginia, "Should A Master's Degree Be Required of All Virginia Teachers?," concluded that:

The empirical evidence indicates that graduate education makes a modest difference . . . , in how they behave in their classrooms, and in their students' learning. There is no reason to believe, however, that graduate education will compensate for other characteristics such as teaching experience or for other factors in schools that influence student learning

In Program Review and Investigations' surveys of teachers and administrators, teachers were asked to evaluate the degree to which the Master's degree program (Rank II) improved their teaching ability and knowledge of specialty area. Ratings were made on a scale of 1-5 (does not improve-greatly improves). Analysis of variance revealed that a teacher's perception of program effectiveness was associated with the rank he or she had attained. Survey results are presented in Table 4. Duncan's Multiple Range Tests showed that teachers with Rank I rated both dimensions of the master's degree program more favorably than teachers with Rank II or Rank III. Rank II teachers, in turn, rated the master's program more favorably than teachers with Rank III.

TABLE 4
Administrator's and Teacher's Views on
Master's Program Effectiveness
(Mean Scores)

QUESTION	TEACHER RANK			ADMINISTRATORS
	I	II	III	
To what degree does the Master's degree program or its equivalent:				
Improve one's speciality area knowledge?	3.5	> 3.1	> 2.6	3.2
Improve one's teaching ability?	3.2	> 2.8	> 2.3	3.0

Note: 1 = does not improve; 5 = greatly improves

SOURCE: LRC, Program Review and Investigation Surveys of Kentucky Teachers and Administrators, 1988.

Academic Credits Could Be Guided by Performance Evaluations and Growth Plans

Two features of Kentucky's recertification requirements may limit criticism regarding the irrelevancy of graduate courses to teachers' needs. First, continuing education required for recertification of the provisional certificate at Rank II requires an academic specialization component and study in a professional education area. A 12-hour academic

specialization component has also been added to the requirements for obtaining the optional standard certificate at Rank II. Second, 704 KAR 20:010 requires that the graduate level program be planned in advance by the teacher and the graduate advisor, and include elements of professional education as well as academic specialization.

A needs assessment process for the planned fifth-year program should produce a relevant program of studies. The relevancy of graduate level training could be enhanced if the planned program developed by the teacher and the graduate advisor is supplemented by outside assessments of the teacher's needs. Outside assessment are currently available in the form of local school district teacher performance evaluations. All beginning teachers are required to be evaluated by their internship committee using a formal behavioral instrument, as well as observation comments which help identify strengths and weaknesses. Non-tenured teachers are required to be evaluated by their immediate supervisors each year, and tenured teachers are to be evaluated every three years. Although this is still a relatively new and inconsistent process, the suggested evaluative instrument does contain a provision for a "growth plan," based upon strengths, weaknesses and areas of possible further development. Currently, there is no required link between these evaluations and the teacher's fifth-year or professional development plan. However, input from these sources could help tie professional development to performance development needs, as well as career development goals.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Planned Fifth-Year Program

The State Board of Education should modify 704 KAR 20:020 to have the following teacher assessments, which are relevant at the time, considered in an advisory way when developing the "approved plan" leading to a master's degree or equivalent fifth-year program:

- The final report of the teacher's internship committee;
- Objective(s) of the teacher's district evaluation growth plan; and
- Written observations made by the teacher's district supervisor/evaluator.

Although there are no substantive differences in this recommendation and the original staff recommendation, the wording is different. The amended recommendation includes compromise language agreed upon by the committee, the staff, the Department of Education and the Kentucky Education Association to satisfy concerns of the latter two parties that the original wording would infringe upon the personal choice and privacy of teachers.

In-Service

The second major component of recertification is in-service. In the Mississippi report, *A Report to the Governor on Education*, (1982), in-service is defined as short-term training that is generally felt to be conducive to providing teachers with information and/

or technical skills (e.g. classroom management techniques, introduction of new curricula) that improve “the educational process and administrative workings of the schools and district.”

Common observations regarding in-service noted in a 1984 SREB publication on in-service included:

- New or different approaches discussed in courses, workshops, or seminars are unlikely to take hold unless teachers have the opportunity to apply them and receive feedback and coaching in these efforts;
- Isolated in-service days are unlikely to have a lasting impact; and
- Summer institutes, with follow-up through the year, have proven effective in training teachers to promote more and improved writing by students or to conduct advanced placement courses in high schools.

Currently, Kentucky law requires all teachers to participate in four days of in-service each year. However, teachers in the Jefferson County school system are exempt from a portion of the state’s requirements for in-service because of the school district’s extensive professional development program. (KRS 156.095(8).) As stated in the section on recertification, four days of in-service participation is all that is required for recertification when a teacher has Rank II credentials and teaches three years out of the five year recertification period.

Kentucky’s four days of in-service amount to twenty-four actual contact hours. One day (six hours) must be planned and offered to the districts by DOE under state law. According to DOE, one other day may be used for parent-teacher conferences. Although state regulations permit flexible timing and programming, cost factors often influence offerings. For example, days when students are off provide a cost-saving choice to local districts. Also, offering programs for all teachers rather than small groups or individuals is generally more cost effective. Only a minority of districts utilize the more costly and flexible approaches to in-service which permit teachers more freedom of choice in scheduling professional development activities. However, some districts in Kentucky and many other states are adopting professional development strategies which allow teachers to have a greater choice.

The DOE Has Statutory Responsibility to Establish, Direct and Maintain a Statewide In-Service Program

Under KRS 156.095 the SBE is directed to establish, direct and maintain the statewide in-service program for the purposes of:

- improving classroom instruction;
- improving leadership qualities; and
- generating professional competence.

The statewide program for in-service is monitored by the Division of Curriculum and Staff Development in DOE. The DOE contends that in-service needs, design and execution should reside with the local school districts. Local districts are also responsible for funding the training sessions. The total amount budgeted in 1988 to compensate teachers during in-service training was \$16 million dollars, according to DOE, Division of Budget Analysis.

The DOE monitors and assists local district in-service but does not approve or evaluate activities. Staff within the Division of Curriculum and Staff Development review district in-service plans, provide training for local in-service education directors (IED), monitor implementation, and provide a state-sponsored in-service day.

The DOE requires each district to submit a Master In-Service Plan which, in addition to addressing goals and objectives, includes the five elements below:

- Presentation of theory;
- Modeling or demonstration;
- Practice under simulated conditions;
- Structured feedback; and
- Coaching for application.

The Master In-Service Plan does not, however, include a description or listing of specific activities for achieving the goals and objectives. Although administrative regulations provide guidelines on appropriate content for in-service programs, the DOE does not have procedures for identifying inappropriate in-service plans before they are executed. DOE officials acknowledge this problem but indicate that potential problems are sometimes averted because many district IEDs discuss their specific plans with them. Furthermore, the DOE claims to discourage district activities which appear peripheral to instruction.

DOE staff feel that the overall quality of in-service programs has improved. Historically, district in-service was more ad hoc, evolving around the use of resources available on short notice, particularly on snow days. The delivery of in-service programs is now more systematic, due to the Master Plan requirement and more restrictive regulations.

In-Service programs vary from district to district. In-service days are fulfilled through a delivery system composed of seminars, workshops, lectures, etc. In-service training is usually provided by paid consultants, university faculty, and state and local professionals. Program offerings have included assistance with assertive discipline, the needs of the middle school student, library instruction, and effective teaching skills. In addition, lecture topics which have been specifically addressed include AIDS education, drug abuse, arts in the lower grades, and computer training. Most of the topics are covered in one-day seminars. Over the last two years, approximately seventy districts have participated in a fifteen-hour seminar on teacher expectations/student achievement (TESA).

which assists teachers in learning to use equally effective training skills for both high and low achievers. In addition, the state offers a daylong program, mandated annually, on a regional basis. Districts are permitted to use one day for parent-teacher conferences. Still, many districts work collectively, developing in-service programs through consortia, which are frequently focused around resources from a state university.

According to DOE Division of Pupil Personnel, 60 percent of the districts provide some type of flexible in-service for their teachers. There are two types of flexible in-service:

- Flexible days or times when teachers may attend in-service training; and
- Flexible in-service programs whereby teachers may establish individual in-service plans, subject to district approval, incorporating specific needs and laying out the opportunities for fulfilling the plan.

Either instance must include mandated programs. The statutes permit all districts to offer flexible in-service within the required program constraints.

In-Service May Benefit the District More Than It Benefits Teachers

Ultimately, decisions about the type and form of in-service training are made at the district level. Frequently these decisions are based on an identified district-wide need or a consensus reached by teachers and administrators as to the overall needs of the district. The Kentucky General Assembly has also mandated training on specific social issues. Thus, in-service currently may provide more social issue education and training, based on the needs of a majority of teachers, than professional development based on individual needs. In 1988, the General Assembly mandated that in-service programs had to be offered for training teachers in significant civic and social issues, e.g., family life, voter education and Kentucky government. In addition, the Kentucky General Assembly has mandated that the Department of Education provide one day of in-service each year.

State regulations define the purpose of in-service as meeting school system needs. According to 704 KAR 3:035 (1), in-service education means satisfying the “need(s) of the school system . . . determined by deficiencies in the instructional, administrative and support services of the school system.” Section 3 continues to describe the Master In-Service Plan as addressing “any local district instructional improvement or training needs . . . ,” and stipulates that activities “shall address teachers’ instructional assignments,” and “support the local school district’s instructional improvement goal(s)”

Pursuant to 704 KAR 3:035, an In-Service Education Director is appointed to develop and coordinate local programs and activities with the assistance of a representative in-service education committee. After receiving state training, the IED and the committee develop a Master In-Service Plan which outlines district goals and objectives based on a needs assessment. They also determine the means for evaluating in-service plans and activities. After the DOE has approved the Master In-Service Plan, the committee and the IED assign the specific activities. Many districts develop long-range plans, up to five years.

To derive an adequate needs assessment, committees frequently survey teachers and administrators for personal needs as well as school and district needs. According to the Program Review and Investigations survey of teachers and administrators, most teachers believed that the in-service delivery system was open to their input. Seventy-four percent of the teachers indicated that they had an opportunity to make suggestions regarding the design and content of the local in-service days. On the other hand, 25.9 percent of the teachers responded that they did not have the opportunity.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Survey of Local District In-Service Needs

The SBE should modify 704 KAR 3:035 to ensure that all teachers in local school districts are surveyed or have an opportunity to make suggestions as to the content and design of local in-service programs.

Kentucky Teachers' Views on In-Service

In the Program Review and Investigations' survey, teachers were asked to make a series of judgments about in-service programs. Ratings were made on a four point scale, ranging from 0 ("not at all useful") to 3 ("useful"). The survey results indicated that 71.1 percent of the teachers thought that current in-service programs in their district were either "somewhat useful" or "useful," while 28.9 percent rated the current local district in-service programs as either "not at all useful" or "not very useful."

Teachers were also asked about the professional development opportunities experienced during in-service programs. Respondents indicated (by checking all that applied) that in-service had given them a chance to:

- Improve teaching skills (48.9%);
- Become more knowledgeable about a specialty area (42.7%);
- Meet with parents (38.5%);
- Develop better classroom management skills (38.3%); and
- Catch up on paperwork (18.8%).

Kentucky teachers want in-service or professional development opportunities more individualized. Although, the district needs assessment process allows teacher input, the product is a consensus of administrators and teachers. Therefore, if the district does not permit flexible in-service, individual teachers may not receive professional development in areas of their particular needs or concerns.

To adequately address the individual professional development needs of teachers, in-service programs need to be more individualized. Kentucky Education Association (KEA) officials interviewed regarding professional development indicated that traditional "cattle call" in-service programs do not always serve the needs of individual teachers. The flexible in-service program is an attempt to address individual needs.

Teachers were also asked to rate the usefulness of several different in-service objectives. The mean usefulness ratings (scale: 0 - 3) for the different in-service objectives are presented below:

In-Service Objectives	Mean Ratings
● To improve knowledge of specialty area	2.48
● To improve teaching skills	2.40
● To learn effective techniques for classroom management	2.20
● To meet professional development needs identified in my performance evaluation	1.95
● To focus on contemporary and social issues in education	1.84
● To attend to organizational/administrative matters in my school district	1.71

Thus, the teachers assigned the greatest utility to district in-service programs designed to improve their knowledge of specialty areas, improve their teaching skills, and teach effective techniques for classroom management. Teachers' needs in all these areas will vary greatly depending on years of experience, subject areas, personality and past training. Some of the unique needs of teachers were expressed in their open-ended responses to the Program Review and Investigations' survey. When teachers were asked "What suggestions do you have for improving the value of in-service days?", their responses included:

Make them course-specific. Motivational speakers are great for full faculty meetings, but do not address specific areas in which we have problems. English teachers need to find ways to handle the enormous paperwork we generate as we try to teach writing skills. We need help with techniques for reaching low achievers, making realistic goals accessible, etc.

Offer more classes dealing with motivational techniques for the different ability levels, effective discipline plans, current teaching methods for presenting the subject skills in an interesting fun way that is effective for learning especially in the language arts and math areas.

Survey the teachers to find out what their needs and concerns are. Set up in-service to meet these needs with "talented" leaders to give the in-service.

In-service days should be included which enhance our curriculum

instructional units.

Rather than one district having in-service several smaller districts may combine so specialty areas may have experts with whom to consult or utilize floating in-service.

Teachers should be able to “flex” more often. Needs are often too individualized to be met by a large in-service program. Teachers should be able to choose an option more important to his/her area and needs.

Have several programs available for individual educators to choose from. First and second year educators have different needs than those of veteran educators. Tailor in-service for specific groups or subject areas, not all programs are useful to all areas.

More emphasis on content area! We can only stand so much of the same old stuff - like drug education, classroom management, working with “at risk” kids. Give us some meaty subjects.

Scrap them. I’ve never been to one that was worth the effort it took to get dressed to attend. They are usually conducted by former teachers who burned out in the classroom and can’t afford to stop working.

Most in-service days in my district are geared toward elementary programs. As I teach high school level classes, I do not find these in-service programs to be useful. If in-service programs were offered in my subject area and grade level, I might find them productive rather than a waste of my time.

With flexible in-service days, there needs to be a “central” source (throughout the state) in order to enable educators to know what is available for them and to obtain information about such meetings. Also, regional meetings for specific groups of teachers (i.e., 1st grade; H.S. Math; H.S. Business, etc.) would be nice if they were well planned and organized.

Less lecture and more demonstration, techniques, and practical suggestions for effective teaching.

These concerns can be more adequately addressed if the districts utilize flexible in-service. With this approach, experiences can be tailored to the individual. Flexible in-service allows for a variety of activities to be obtained from a variety of sources. However, individualized and flexible in-service programs will probably increase the cost of professional development, both in administrative time and money. In-service requires a

large commitment of resources. Over \$16 million was budgeted in 1988 for in-service programs. If additional professional development among teachers is a top priority, then the state and the districts will have to pay more for it.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Cost and Effectiveness Study of In-Service Day

The Department of Education should study the cost and effectiveness of requiring that a portion of the local district in-service programs be based upon individual teacher needs either by:

- devoting one of the four current in-service days to flexible individual professional development; or
- adding one additional day of in-service to the calendar year for individual professional development.

State and Profession Strategies for Professional Development

Approaches to professional development vary among states, local school districts and different professions. National study groups, such as the Carnegie Forum and the Holmes Group, have called for greater attention to professional development for the teaching profession. Major changes in Kentucky's approaches to professional development may increase the \$16 million expense the state currently incurs for in-service. However, the effectiveness of current expenditures has not been estimated and the possibilities of more cost-effective approaches do exist.

In-service and professional development services are provided through alternative methods in at least three areas of the state. A professional development center, a professional development team model and a professional development network all involve joint ventures between local districts and institutions of higher education. In addition, the state has established teacher institutes.

Professional Development Centers Enhance Teachers' Involvement in Their Pursuit of Professional Development

Generally, professional development centers are viewed as a means to improve or enhance teacher job performance through a combination of in-service and personal professional development programs. Services are directed toward meeting teachers' needs as well as ensuring that they have a more active role in the identification, planning, development and delivery of services. In the monograph *Issues in Teacher Education* (1986), Richard Wallace, Jr. stated that:

Teacher centers were designed to provide an opportunity for teachers to come together to direct and pursue their own professional development.

The designs for professional development centers vary. These may be school-university collaborative organizations or free-standing, district-level organizations with district-appointed governing bodies. Also, some centers may develop specialty areas, with research efforts examining the complexities of teaching, learning and teacher preparation.

The Gheens Academy in Jefferson County is the prototype for the professional development center in Kentucky. In 1983, the Jefferson County Public Schools and the Gheens Professional Development Academy formed a joint venture which established an infrastructure through which professional development for teachers is linked to systematic school and classroom improvement. The Academy provides teachers, counselors and administrators in the district with a variety of staff development and support programs. One goal of the Academy is to “increase the success of the teachers and administrators in the Jefferson County Public Schools . . . by providing services/programs which promote peer support, afford recognition for performance, and increase the variety of intellectual opportunities available to staff.”

In addition to standard in-service programs, the Academy offers programs designed to promote systematic change and encourage faculties to develop and try new practices. The Academy also: conducts summer institutes on restructuring, provides initial and follow-up computer training plus computer related curriculum materials, pays stipends for teachers to conduct in-service programs after hours, and presents a lecture series by professionals in the field. Teachers and administrators have access to technical assistance via a professional development library, curriculum resource and special education materials centers, computer support, and grant writing assistance. Likewise, the Academy provides resource and support groups for beginning teachers, tenured teachers and principals. The Academy has designated fifteen schools in the district as “Professional Development Schools”. These schools serve as exemplars of teaching and administrative practice by providing “hands on” training for new teachers and administrators.

The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence recommends professional development centers for continuing education in Kentucky. The 1985 Prichard Committee report *The Path to a Larger Life*, recommends that school districts create teacher centers (professional development centers) to provide on-going and comprehensive professional development for teachers. The report further recommends that pilot programs for the centers be supported by the State Department of Education (SDE). The report indicates that the centers should:

- Assist teachers in determining their own training needs;
- Identify priority training needs and ways of providing that training;
- Use exceptional teachers to help other teachers;
- Use the center to share ideas and work in groups, to study different teaching styles, or to develop new curricula;

- Assign center staff to help teachers develop individual growth plans; provide on-going assistance to teachers, in this area, rather than one-time seminars.

The “Prichard Committee Response to the Report of the Task Force on Teacher Education and Certification,” (December 1986), proposed regional teacher development academies or institutes as an alternative means of teacher certification. According to this report, these institutes or academies would help teachers develop individual professional development plans either for certification or recertification. Two tasks were proposed for these academies: 1) support revitalized continuing education for practicing teachers, and 2) oversee a three-year training period for new teachers prior to their certification. The proposal further stated that:

These institutes would be staffed by a combination of university faculty, school administrators, teachers and staff to provide counseling and guidance to teachers in developing their own professional development programs.

The Professional Development Team Approach Maximizes Opportunities For Professional Interaction Among Teachers

Fayette County uses a professional development team approach to promote professional development for teachers. A partnership similar to that formed in Jefferson County has been developed by the Fayette County Schools and the College of Education at the University of Kentucky. The Professional Development Team model adopted by the partnership is designed to permit greater attention to the professional needs of small groups of teachers, provide greater opportunities to design unique field experiences for teacher education students, provide teamwork experience for teachers and university students, and provide maximum opportunities for professional interaction among teachers. The approach also expands the utilization of university faculty as resources for teachers and of teachers in university clinical faculty roles. The University of Kentucky received a mini-grant from the Appalachia Educational Laboratory for partial funding of the model. The Dean of the College of Education reports that so far teachers are calling involvement in these development teams one of the best professional experiences of their careers.

The Professional Development Network Approach Relies on University Faculty to Deliver Professional Training

The Professional Development Center Network (PDCN) program located at Western Kentucky University, is a consortium of the University and twenty-eight public school districts, including parochial schools, in western Kentucky. According to the 1988 status report, “The College of Education and Behavioral Sciences: A Status Report,” the PDCN conducts needs assessments for the participating school districts and coordinates the development, delivery, and evaluation of staff development experiences for certified personnel. The \$70,000 annual funding is primarily financed through membership fees paid by participating districts.

Centers of Excellence Offer Opportunities to Establish Professional Development Alternatives

The 1986 General Assembly appropriated \$3.9 dollars to fund Centers of Excellence and Endowed Chairs at the public higher education institutions. Two projects relating to teacher education were awarded a portion of these funds.

The Center for Collaborative Advancement of the Teaching Profession, located at the University of Louisville, received \$265, 276 to design and implement fundamentally new programs of teacher preparation and continuing professional development. A developmental grant of \$57,361 was awarded to Western Kentucky University to partially support a proposal for "Teacher Education and Professional Development."

Two Types of Teacher Institutes Are Available in the State

The Commonwealth Institute (CIT), authorized by KRS 156.097 for the "general improvement of instruction in the Commonwealth," is a week-long summer program with two follow-up sessions held during the year. According to a DOE official, the CIT is geared toward the professional development of the teacher and provides an opportunity for teachers to gather and discuss concerns and issues related to education. These institutes have been held on four campuses and have covered such topics as drug abuse, drop-out prevention, burnout, job stress, and statistics on Kentucky education programs. The CITs have also presented inspirational and motivational speakers. A \$30,000 grant from the Kentucky Educational Foundation is used to cover speaker fees of over \$1000.

CIT participants are selected on the basis of "a demonstrated record of effectiveness." According to 701 KAR 5:070, the selection criteria may include professional credentials, development, experience, honors, awards, recognition of effective teaching, innovative teaching techniques (e.g. curricula developed, award-winning students) and an essay which shows initiative and states reasons for wanting to attend the institute. Teachers are paid a \$400 stipend for the week-long session, \$75 for the follow-up sessions, and \$50 for travel expenses. Generally, 100-150 teachers attend a session.

Administrative Regulation 704 KAR 20:015(2) refers to another type of teacher institute. This one provides a means for teachers to acquire credit toward Rank I. According to the regulation, these institutes were designed "for the purpose of upgrading classroom teaching personnel in their teaching specialities."

Other States Are Trying Either More Flexible Approaches or Those Based on Performance Needs

Arkansas has adopted a statewide program, the Program for Effective Training (PET). PET was initiated as a response to accountability concerns, and emphasizes mastery of basic skills and academic excellence. It is based on six interrelated and interdependent components. They include:

- knowledge of content;
- planning skills;

- selection and use of appropriate skills;
- classroom management;
- human relations skills; and
- instructional skills based on human growth and development.

The last component receives the greatest emphasis.

PET emphasizes teaching toward objectives. Although there has been no rigorous evaluation of the program, reaction among participants seems to be positive. The annual cost is about \$500,000. This is a total package developed to enhance classroom learning. Kentucky has not used this particular package, but many districts have used the TESA package, which could achieve similar goals and objectives.

North Carolina includes an additional facet to in-service training by actively involving university arts and sciences faculties. One objective of the North Carolina program is to add prestige, subject depth, and additional university-wide commitment to in-service training. This approach also endorses the perspective that teachers' continuing education should contain additional work in the basic concepts of the subjects being taught. Here again, one-shot workshops have been rejected for the most part. Kentucky has not used this approach, but it would seem beneficial, particularly in enhancing academic specialities.

Florida has established Teacher Education Centers for the benefit of all of its school districts. These Centers are simply organizational units, with over half of the members being teachers. The Centers are charged with determining teacher needs and securing providers from universities and private consultants. The approach is geared toward making training relevant to teacher and district needs. These centers are organized at the district level and might resemble the Gheens Professional Development Academy in Jefferson County.

Louisiana initiated a statewide Professional In-Service Program (PIP) by stipulating that teachers in the program must agree to develop five-year committee-approved plans. Thereafter, salary increments are based on a point system, with points awarded for academic credits and/or staff development activities. The average increment is approximately \$2000, with over 70% participation. Consequently, the annual cost has been \$70,000 or more since the 1982-83 school year. An SREB survey determined that teachers and administrators reported a positive effect on the classroom, but the PIP may not be either time efficient for teachers or cost efficient to the state.

Many Other Professions Allow Individualized Professional Development

While not all professions require continuing education or professional development, most recognize the need to maintain standards and competency within the profession. Therefore, continuing education is usually either encouraged or mandated.

The Program Review staff conducted a telephone survey of licensing boards to determine the continuing education requirements for ten professions. Those contacted were veterinarians, nurses, pharmacists, dentists, accountants, lawyers, doctors, realtors, cosmetologists and engineers. The first six professions require continuing education, in varying degrees, for license renewal. Such requirements are mandated by statutes, regulations or a Supreme Court ruling. Although the other four professions do not require continuing education, the professional organizations offer it.

Continuing education, in the various professions contacted, is usually provided through local or convention seminars, institutions of higher education, or correspondence courses. In all instances, the choice of subject matter is determined by the practitioner and is frequently geared to his or her specialty area or practice. This concept may more accurately exemplify professional development in that the focus is on serving individual needs. In most instances, the professional pays for his or her continuing education. However, some seminars are wholly or partially paid for by membership dues. Accountants and attorneys are afforded the opportunity for national professional board recognition and membership upon completion of a term in the profession and/or specific continuing education requirements.

Since the survey was conducted for informational purposes, and because of the variation in regulations and standards, no comparisons between teaching and the other professions were made, and no conclusions were drawn. The variations in continuing education among professions were most related to time constraints, complexity of undergraduate requirements for entry, internship or residency requirements, and financial remuneration following licensure. Table 5 shows a wide range of minimum continuing education requirements in other professions. The range varies from 8 to 20 hours annually to a point system based on activities.

TABLE 5
Minimum Continuing Education Requirements
in Other Professions

<u>Profession</u>	<u>Requirement</u>
Veterinarian	8 class hours annually
Nurse	30 contact hours biennially*
Pharmacist	15 contact hours annually
Dentist	10 points annually
Accountant	20 hours annually
Lawyer	15 credit hours annually

Note: *The actual requirement is 30 contact hours every two years.
In academic credit, one semester 15 hours.

SOURCE: LRC, Program Review and Investigations Telephone Survey, 1988.

CHAPTER IV

THE COMPENSATION/PERFORMANCE LINK

In response to national and state calls for education reform, policymakers have begun to examine various means of compensating teachers. Generally, teacher compensation has been based on degrees held and seniority. However, reports advocating changes in education have begun recommending that compensation be linked to performance. The Carnegie report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, (1986) stated that:

Teacher compensation systems should be based on the following attributes:

1. Job function — level of responsibility
2. Competence — as determined by level of board certification
3. Seniority — experience in the classroom
4. Productivity — contribution to improved student performance.

Also, the Prichard Committee report, *The Path to a Larger Life: Creating Kentucky's Educational Future* (1985), indicated that, "Necessary salary increases must be combined with a way of recognizing superior performance and rewarding it."

As states seek better ways to reward teachers, and to increase their status and salaries, the underlying theme seems to be that teachers should be rewarded on the basis of performance instead of degrees and longevity. In varying degrees, alternative compensation plans use strategies that, in addition to rewarding performance, use the skills of veteran teachers and provide career advancement opportunities for teachers.

Performance/Compensation Link in Other States

Most states have considered or implemented incentive programs which are generally performance-based and require a teacher evaluation plan. The SREB report, "Is Paying for Performance Changing Schools?" (1988), indicates that 44 of the 50 states tried the following types of programs: teacher incentive, career ladder, career development, mentor teacher, school incentive, career compensation, tiered certification incentive or combinations of the above. In the face of tight budget constraints, some states and local school districts are offering non-monetary rewards.

Pay-for-Performance Programs Seek to Recognize and Reward High Achievement

Merit pay programs are designed to reward those teachers or schools judged to have performed exceptionally well. Generally, teachers must be successfully evaluated and the schools must meet or exceed certain standards. For example, South Carolina's School Incentive Award Program distributes money to schools that meet certain criteria, which include student achievement gain and student and teacher attendance. The money

is to be used for instructional purposes. Some schools receive other awards, such as flags and certificates for achievement.

Teacher Classification Schemes Tie Ability and Compensation

The Carnegie and Holmes reports call for a compensation system based on a restructured workforce, i.e., teachers with different levels of experience and ability should be paid at different rates. The Carnegie report proposed a “lead teacher” concept. A lead teacher would have advanced certification from a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, have a number of years of experience, and be regarded as a leader by his or her peers. Duties of a lead teacher might include coordinating the work of the school’s instructional staff; making staff assignments for teachers, instructional specialists, and tutors; and becoming more involved in the decision-making regarding student achievement. Lead teachers would be held accountable for school performance.

The Holmes Group also suggested a differentiated staffing pattern. The faculty would consist of three levels—instructor, professional teacher, career professional teacher. The instructor would hold a B.A. with a specialization in a subject area, have to pass basic competency examinations, and would work under the supervision of a career professional teacher. The professional teacher would hold an M.A., pass a competency evaluation and would teach without supervision. The career professional teacher would hold a Ph.D. or equivalent, and be capable of assuming classroom or administrative responsibilities.

Career ladder programs are designed to offer career advancement within the school setting. Career ladder programs attempt to identify and reward outstanding performance as well as offer career advancement within the classroom. Generally, career ladder programs provide for a 3-4 step advancement plan with an evaluation and a bonus or salary increase tied to each change in step. Career ladder plans are similar to the current ranking system in that they provide for differentiated pay. However, they base the difference on performance, as opposed to seniority and/or the level of educational attainment. Career ladder plans also require teachers at the upper levels to perform different or additional tasks, such as acting as a mentor for new teachers, working a longer school year to complete special projects, or participating in curriculum development.

Tennessee’s Career Ladder Program, which has been operating for five years, is a voluntary program consisting of three levels. Those appointed to the career ladder receive salary supplements. Teachers are evaluated on the local level for Probationary, Apprentice and Career Level I. Candidate evaluations for Career Levels II and III are conducted by a team of peers from another school district. Teachers are evaluated in six areas: preparation for instruction, use of teaching strategies and procedures appropriate to content objectives and learners, use of evaluation to improve instruction and assess students, management of classroom activities, establishment and maintenance of leadership role, and effective communication. The evaluation system uses data collected from teachers, principals, students and state evaluators.

Program changes implemented in 1987 included making participation optional for all teachers except those at the probationary and apprentice levels. There are two separate licensing and certification tracks. One track offers the optional career ladder certificate, while the other offers the mandatory professional license. The latter requires a one-year probationary period and a three-year apprenticeship. If a teacher successfully passes the local evaluation, he or she receives a 10-year professional license.

Master teacher plans seek to provide mentors. The master teacher concept and the career ladder concept may often overlap, as those teachers who have reached the upper levels of a career ladder program may be referred to as master teachers. Master teachers are experienced teachers who are selected to work with beginning teachers, teachers new to a school district or teachers experiencing difficulties with performance. In addition, master teachers may work as curriculum specialists, instructional leaders, evaluators, or consultants. These teachers usually receive bonuses and/or release time to perform these extra duties. Master teachers may spend less time in the classroom because they are expected to provide leadership and guidance.

In 1986, the Rochester City School District and Rochester Teachers' Association started the Peer Assistance and Review Program (PAR). The program's goal "is to provide as much help as possible to new and inexperienced teachers (Internship) and to make a concerted effort to improve the teaching performance of tenured teachers who are experiencing severe difficulties (Intervention)." PAR is based on a plan developed in Toledo, Ohio. Toledo's internship and intervention program released outstanding teachers, for three years, to help train new teachers and help tenured teachers having problems with classroom performance.

While participation in the PAR internship is mandatory, utilizing intervention services is voluntary. PAR consulting teachers must have 10 years' experience, and are not eligible for appointments to administrative or supervisory positions during PAR tenure or for two years thereafter. PAR teachers receive release time and a 10 percent salary increase for serving as mentors. PAR was incorporated into the Rochester Board of Education's career program. The career program consist of Interns (first year), residents (1-4 years), professional teachers (fully licensed), and lead teachers.

Teacher Compensation Can Involve Non-Monetary Rewards

Providing professional recognition and additional professional development opportunities (non-monetary incentives) have also been suggested as alternative methods for rewarding teachers. ("Merit, Money and Master — Rewards for the Teacher," *CSG Backgrounder*, 1983) Examples of such options are: 1) identifying superior teachers and recognizing them publicly, holding a reception in their honor, and providing opportunities for them to serve on committees and teams; 2) developing "teacher of the year" programs; 3) presenting certificates; 4) presenting letters of appreciation for community service; 5) encouraging board members to personally recognize teachers by visiting their classes; 6) encouraging businesses to grant awards in subject areas; and 7) sending teachers to conventions or paying for training or self-improvement classes.

Compensation/Performance Link in Kentucky

Currently, Kentucky's system for teacher compensation, referred to as the "rank" system, is based on academic credits and years of experience. Kentucky has experimented with performance-based pay. Furthermore, a teacher evaluation plan has been required at the local level since 1985. Nevertheless, the current evaluation process is not linked to compensation.

Kentucky Compensates Teachers for Professional Development Activities and Tenure

Kentucky's ranking system performs two functions: 1) it establishes employee classification system guidelines for teachers, and 2) it acknowledges and rewards teachers for participating in continuing education. The statute on ranking, KRS 157.390(2)(a), directs the Superintendent of Public Instruction to ". . . classify all teachers in each rank by their years of experience for purposes of the state teachers salary" This statute also specifies the amount of additional academic training on which each rank is based. Therefore, the classification system established is based on a teacher's level of educational attainment and seniority (years of experience within a rank). Qualifications per rank are as follows:

- Rank I — hold a regular certificate, have a master's degree or equivalent, and have completed thirty semester hours of graduate work or equivalent above the master's or equivalent,
- Rank II — hold a regular certificate and have a master's degree in an approved subject area or equivalent,
- Rank III — hold a regular certificate and have completed a four-year degree or equivalent;
- Ranks IV-VII — used to issue emergency certificates to persons with less than a four year degree or equivalent.

The ranking system is an administrative tool for scheduling salaries. As a compensation system, the ranking system is easy to manage. The statute provides for a centrally administered compensation system for all school districts. Local administrators have a minimal role. The requirements for advancing within the system and salary schedules are established in administrative regulations promulgated by the DOE (704 KAR 20:010, 015, 020). Transcript analysis and verification of completed academic work are the responsibility of the DOE. Local administrators need only verify the conditions of employment if they are a requirement for a rank or certification change. Achievement of a higher rank is not based on a teacher's performance on an evaluation conducted by the state or the employing school district. Accordingly, academic performance standards are set by the college or university issuing the approved credits.

The ranking system also promotes professional development activities. In addition to establishing a salary scale, the ranking system provides an incentive to pursue

continuing education. Administrative regulation 704 KAR 20:010, which sets out the master's degree requirements and fifth year plans, infers that the legislative intent of the ranking system was to improve competency. According to the regulation, preparation programs for Ranks II and I must be planned in advance for one or more of the following purposes:

- To improve the professional competency for the position covered by the initial teaching certificate;
- To extend the scope of professional competency for the position covered by the initial teaching certificate; and
- To obtain preparation-certification required for professional advance to a higher position.

To maintain one's teaching certification (employment eligibility), a teacher must complete Rank II requirements (i.e., attainment of a master's degree or equivalent) within 10 years of initial certification. Accordingly, this ensures a minimum level of professional development in the form of continuing education during the first 10 years of a teacher's career. Teachers may complete Rank I requirements (i.e., 30 semester hours of graduate credit above a master's or equivalent) and obtain an additional salary increase.

In conclusion, the ranking system is very familiar to teachers and administrators and rewards additional professional development. It establishes a promotion system that is not contingent upon a performance evaluation. However, it does not provide for differentiated responsibilities or out-of-the-classroom responsibilities among the ranks. Finally, it does not necessarily promote additional professional development beyond Rank I.

Kentucky Has Experimented with Performance-Based Pay

Two attempts at performance-based pay in Kentucky have not been successful. A career ladder pilot project failed to win support. Dr. Stephen Miller, former executive director of the Kentucky Career Ladder Commission staff, states, in the report *Organization and Management of a Statewide Teacher Evaluation System* (1988):

The Career Ladder Pilot, controversial from the beginning, apparently fell victim to political opposition, lack of support and a general shortage of state funding.

A bonus-pay plan implemented in the 1985 special session established an evaluation plan but has not been funded.

Kentucky initiated a career ladder pilot project in 1985. Kentucky's Career Ladder Pilot Project had as its stated purposes the following:

- to provide outstanding teachers an opportunity for recognition and monetary reward;

- to improve the quality of classroom instruction;
- to encourage professional development;
- to increase the attractiveness of teaching as a profession; and
- to improve the public's confidence in teachers and schools.

Kentucky's Career Ladder Commission proposed a 4-step program with evaluations conducted by a career ladder committee before a teacher could move from one step to another. Evaluations, using a point award system, were proposed for the following areas: instructional performance, professional growth and development, professional leadership/initiative, and student achievement.

The proposed plan would have offered higher salaries and promoted continuing professional development since teachers would have been evaluated every five years in order to remain in steps 3 or 4. Due to fiscal problems, the project was only funded for one year and the major accomplishment was the development and field-testing of a teacher evaluation process. The Commission recommended that the DOE continue the research and testing related to teacher evaluation and establish three demonstration sites. The demonstration sites were not funded during the 1988 session of the General Assembly.

A bonus pay plan created in 1985 established an evaluation program for teachers and administrators. The intent of the legislation was to provide:

a means of improving the educational productivity in Kentucky's public schools, of providing a method by which the citizens of the Commonwealth can be assured of measures of accountability of the performance of certified school employees, and of providing encouragement and incentives for certified school employees to improve their performance

Under KRS 156.101, non-administrative certified employees who successfully completed an evaluation process were to receive \$300 during the 1987-88 school year. However, the award was not funded by the General Assembly. Subsequently, language referring to the \$300 payment has been deleted from proposed revisions of 704 KAR 3:345.

Through 704 KAR 3:345, the SBE is responsible for developing the guidelines, initially training, testing and certifying evaluators, reviewing district plans, monitoring implementation, providing technical assistance, and conducting state hearings.

The evaluation program is conducted at the local district level according to SBE guidelines. The district, through an ad hoc committee of teachers and administrators, is responsible for developing the plan and forms, notifying evaluators and evaluatees about the evaluation procedures, ensuring that evaluators receive training in the use of the plan, and providing an appeals process.

The evaluation, conducted by the teacher's immediate supervisor, is designed to measure performance by the following criteria:

- Performs professional responsibilities and duties as outlined in the job description, including regular attendance and punctuality;
- Demonstrates effective classroom/staff management skills;
- Uses instructional strategies and processes effectively;
- Demonstrates effective interpersonal and communication skills with peers, subordinates, students and parents; and
- Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter or administrative techniques;
- Plans and evaluates instructional or administrative activities (704 KAR 3:345(6)).

Kentucky Teachers' Views on Linking Compensation and Performance

Although many experts in the field of education and employee motivation advocate performance based pay and many states are moving in this direction, Kentucky teachers are generally not enthusiastic about it. First, such a system represents a major change in the traditional longevity pay system. Second, teachers are concerned about the subjectivity of evaluations. Finally, the creation of levels, or at least terms like master, implies competition and a hierarchy in a profession that appreciates a peer structure and collegiality.

Teachers generally do not like performance-based pay. In Program Review's Teacher Survey, respondents were asked to complete the following statement: "Performance-based compensation systems" by checking all of the statements with which they agreed. The survey results, presented in Table 6., revealed that a majority of the respondents thought performance-based compensation systems were difficult to administer and based on subjective or questionable assessment.

TABLE 6

Teacher Responses to Performance-Based Compensation

QUESTION:	Percentages
Performance-based compensation systems: ¹	
are difficult to administer	76.2
are generally based on subjective/questionable assessment	72.4
create unhealthy competition among teachers	54.0
reduce morale among teachers	44.7
motivate teachers to teach better	20.0
enhance the status of teachers	17.4

¹ Note: Respondents could check more than one statement.

SOURCE: LRC, Program Review Survey of Teachers, (1988).

Teachers generally seem to be satisfied with most elements of the ranking system. In Program Review's Teacher Survey, teachers were presented with four methods of compensation and asked to check their preferred method of compensation. The results indicated that 47.9 percent preferred the current ranking system, and 23.6 percent preferred the current ranking system plus one year beyond Rank I. Representatives of a professional organization for teachers indicated that teachers in Kentucky liked the ranking system because it was safe; it protected them from the political realities in the school systems.

Teachers are not enthusiastic about plans that create or impose a hierarchy. Only 4.7 percent of the teachers responding to the survey favored compensation via a career ladder program. Furthermore, representatives of a professional teacher organization stated that teachers would not like the career ladder approach because it would stifle cooperation and collegiality. Moreover, such plans might shift the focus of attention to the numbers (e.g., student achievement test scores) and away from the children. The representatives also stated that master teacher plans could cause similar problems because of the hierarchy imposed. Finally, they suggested that teachers would more likely favor a peer coaching and support approach.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Continue Research on Alternative Compensation

The General Assembly and the SBE should continue to monitor research on alternative teacher compensation systems which are based on demonstrated professional ability.

The original staff recommendation proposed that the General Assembly and the Department of Education continue to research alternative compensation systems. The recommendation was amended in view of objections expressed by the DOE and the CTEC that state resources would be better utilized in funding other education priorities.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Standardize Teacher Evaluation Process

The SBE should standardize the teacher evaluation process in order to improve teacher's confidence in the impartiality and equity of the process.

The original staff recommendation proposed standardizing the teacher evaluation process in order to improve teacher confidence in the impartiality and equity of the process. Some Committee members disagreed that this action would improve teacher confidence, and expressed further concern that it would override local input.

CHAPTER V

TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Several reports suggest that the nation's teaching force may be changing from a condition of surplus to one of shortage. National studies hint that current shortages in the areas of mathematics and science may develop into more generalized teacher shortages within the next few years. This chapter reviews current supply and demand projections and presents various strategies for expanding the pool of available teachers. Methodological problems associated with supply and demand projections are discussed in Appendix F.

National and State Teacher Needs

There is considerable controversy about the scope of teacher shortages at the national level. Shortages are often reported in areas experiencing recent growth or competing with higher paying job opportunities in the public and private sectors. Kentucky also appears to have problems in meeting demands at certain grade levels and curriculum areas. These problems are more acute in rural areas. However, minority and substitute teachers seem to be in short supply in all regions of the state.

National Statistics on Teacher Shortages are Debatable

Not all education analysts believe that this nation is headed toward a serious shortage of teachers. Daniel Hecker, labor economist with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, predicts that no major shortages of teachers will occur, at least through 1995. Mr. Hecker concedes that shortages may continue in some subject areas and for some of the less attractive school districts. However, Mr. Hecker concludes that "higher pay and higher status for teachers, in combination with normal market adjustments, should not only prevent shortages from materializing but may even enable schools to be more selective in hiring." Emily Feistritzer, of the National Center for Education Information, has also disputed the existence of a serious nationwide shortage of teachers. In a 1988 report, Ms. Feistritzer presents evidence that school districts are reporting record numbers of applicants for available teaching positions.

Those educators concerned about teacher shortages point to a reversal in the falling enrollments which occurred for over a decade in elementary and secondary schools. Since the mid 1980s, the so-called "baby boomlet" has caused enrollments to increase gradually at the elementary school level. This demographic phenomenon coincides with a decline in the college-age population from which most new teachers will be recruited. Both the National Education Association (NEA) and the Association for School, College, and University Staffing (ASCUS) present longitudinal data indicating that the supply of new teachers is declining. Furthermore, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) provides data suggesting that the number of graduates from teacher education programs continues to decrease in most southern states.

Research conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) suggests that the supply of new teacher graduates will not keep pace with the demand

for additional teachers. The estimates provided by national surveys are often imprecise and are based upon a number of frequently untested assumptions. Nevertheless, many education analysts are becoming increasingly concerned about a possible shortage of qualified teachers. In 1985, the NCES projected the annual supply of new teacher graduates until 1992-93. These figures were then compared to the projected demand for additional teachers over the same time period. The results of their analyses are presented in Table 7. Several findings have emerged from the research conducted by NCES:

- The projected demand for additional teachers will increase from 165,000 in 1986 to 215,000 in 1992.
- The 1992 projected supply of new teachers is estimated at only 63.7 per cent of the anticipated demand.
- The demand for additional elementary school teachers will rise in 1985 and continue to increase into the first half of the 1990s. The demand for additional secondary school teachers is not expected to rise until the early 1990s.
- The West experienced the greatest number of teacher vacancies, while the Northeast felt the least impact.
- In general, teacher shortages were greatest in districts enrolling 10,000 or more students and in schools located in the inner city.
- The greatest proportional shortages in the public schools were in positions for bilingual education, special education, physics and computer science.

TABLE 7

Past and Projected Trends in Estimated Demand for Classroom Teachers in Elementary/Secondary Schools and Estimated Supply of New Teacher Graduates: United States, Fall 1980 to Fall 1993

(Number in Thousands)								
Fall of Year	Total Estimated Teacher Demand	Estimated Demand for Additional Teachers					Estimated Supply of New Teacher Graduates ¹	New Supply as Percent of Demand for Additional Teachers
		Total	Public	Private	Elementary	Secondary		
1980.....	2,463	134	110	24	76	58	144	107.5
1981.....	2,430	115	85	30	71	44	141	122.6
1982.....	2,445	161	130	31	107	54	143	88.8
1983.....	2,462	164	132	32	98	66	146	89.0
Projected ²								
1984.....	2,457	143	120	23	84	59	146	102.1
1985.....	2,467	158	134	24	96	62	146	92.4
1986.....	2,483	165	139	26	109	56	144	87.3
1987.....	2,505	171	144	27	125	46	142	83.0
1988.....	2,517	162	140	22	124	38	139	85.8
1989.....	2,543	177	146	31	130	47	139	78.5
1990.....	2,580	188	160	28	136	52	139	73.9
1991.....	2,630	204	176	28	138	66	138	67.6
1992.....	2,687	215	181	34	135	80	137	63.7
1993.....	2,737	211	175	36	125	86	133	63.0

¹Estimates for 1980 and 1981 are from National Education Association, *Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1981-82, 1983*. Other estimates developed by the National Center for Education Statistics.

²For methodological details, see *Projections of Education Statistics to 1992-93, 1985*.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Projections of Education Statistics to 1992-93, 1985*, and unpublished tabulations (January 1985); and National Education Association, *Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1981-82, 1983*, copyrighted.

Stricter Teacher Certification and Lower Class Sizes May Have Contributed to the Problem

In recent years most states have adopted more stringent entrance requirements into teacher preparation programs and more demanding standards for certification. For instance, in Kentucky students must now have a 2.5 G.P.A. and earn a passing score on a basic skills test. Students must also pass the National Teacher Examination and participate in a Beginning Teacher Internship Program before they become fully certified. Furthermore, highly specialized certification and endorsement categories create additional demand by restricting teachers from teaching grade levels and courses outside of their specialty areas.

Class size also exerts an impact upon the need for new teachers. In Kentucky, recent legislative initiatives to limit class sizes will result in increased demand for teachers unless the number of students declines. Changes in program approach, such as the move to middle schools and the mandatory Kindergarten adopted in 1985, have increased the demand for teachers with certifications in these areas.

Shortages in Kentucky Are Reported in Rural Areas, Certain Subjects, and Among Substitute and Minority Teachers

In Kentucky, the number of elementary and public school enrollments, as well as the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in education, have declined in recent years. The recent increase in elementary school enrollments at the national level has not occurred in the Commonwealth. In fact, enrollments have decreased by approximately 6 percent over the past decade. On the other hand, the decline in the number of students receiving bachelor's degrees in education does parallel the national trends. Students conferred with education degrees at public institutions declined by approximately 17 percent from 1982-83 to 1986-87.

Kentucky's rural teacher shortages do not form a geographical cluster in any specific region of the state. In 1985, the Department of Education sent the Kentucky Public School Teacher Demand Survey to the superintendents of all public school districts. The questionnaire focused on the superintendents' perception of trends in the areas of recruitment, hiring, and retirement. Most superintendents reported that the teacher supply was adequate. However, severe teacher shortages were reported in 17 school districts in the Commonwealth, while moderate shortages were reported in 55 districts. In regard to those districts experiencing severe shortages, the Department of Education reported that "all but three may be described as relatively remote regions. The location of the districts do not appear to represent a geographical cluster in any specific part of the state."

Shortages are reported in special education, math, science, computer science, foreign languages and substitute and minority teachers. The 1985 survey of school district superintendents revealed that there was an adequate supply of teachers or a slight shortage in most teaching specialties. However, the survey found that there was a current shortage in several subject areas. The results of the teacher demand survey were consistent with the conclusions of an unreleased report produced by the Council on

Higher Education. This 1985 report found that the fields of mathematics, science, foreign languages, distributive education, and special education are experiencing shortages now or will experience them within the next five years.

In 1988, Program Review staff conducted a supply and demand survey of school district superintendents. Administrators were asked to rate the relative surplus or shortage of teachers in a number of different subject areas. Evaluations were made on a 5 point scale, ranging from "considerable surplus" (1) to "considerable shortage" (5). Surpluses of teachers were reported in the areas of physical education and health education. The subject areas experiencing the greatest shortages of teachers were the same specialties identified in other state and national surveys: foreign languages, mathematics, science, computer science and special education. Survey results also indicated that minority and substitute teachers were in short supply around the state. Table 8 presents the superintendents' evaluations of those subject areas with the greatest shortages of teachers. A more detailed list of supply and demand ratings may be found in Appendix B.

TABLE 8
AREAS OF TEACHER SHORTAGE

Specialty Area	MEAN RATINGS		
	K-4	5-8	9-12
Special Education	4.27	4.27	4.28
Foreign Languages	NA	4.17	4.13
Mathematics	NA	3.82	3.92
Science	NA	3.38	3.73
Computer Science	NA	NA	4.87
Teacher Classifications			
Minority	4.41	4.44	4.46
Substitute	4.03	4.07	4.10

*Based on the following scale:

- 1 = Considerable surplus
- 2 = Some surplus
- 3 = Balanced
- 4 = Some shortage
- 5 = Considerable shortage

SOURCE: LRC, Program Review Survey of Administrators (1988)

Analyses of variance revealed differences in the magnitude of shortages experienced by different size school districts for foreign language teachers and substitute teachers. Duncan's Multiple Range Tests showed that relatively large school districts (7,000 students or more) reported greater supplies of foreign language and substitute teachers than smaller school districts. However, superintendents from large school districts also reported experiencing greater than average shortages for these types of teachers.

Countering Supply and Demand Problems

Teacher shortages can be solved by either increasing supply or decreasing demand. Reactive efforts, such as the use of emergency certificates and oversized classes, respond to existing demand problems. On the other hand, proactive solutions, such as loan incentive and alternative certification programs, anticipate problems by increasing the supply of teachers.

In the past five years most state legislatures or state boards of education have implemented programs to recruit teachers through the use of monetary incentives, strategies to improve the experience of teaching, and efforts to attract non-teachers into teaching. According to a report issued by the National School Boards Association (NSBA), these programs have developed as policymakers have become concerned about the number of qualified teachers in the workforce. The bulk of the policies have been designed either to attract non-teachers into the profession or to persuade qualified teachers to seek employment in needy school districts.

Historically, Kentucky has met its supply and demand problems by using several 'stop-gap' measures: the issuing of emergency teaching certificates, the staffing of classes by out-of-field teachers, and the expansion of class sizes beyond state guidelines. Currently, there is limited use of alternative certification and loan incentive programs.

"Stop-gap" Methods Include Emergency Certificates, "Out-of-field" Teachers and Over-sized Classes

Three hundred and thirteen emergency certificates have been issued in Kentucky since 1985. About half of these certificates have been given in several Special Education specialties, particularly Learning and Behavior Disorders. Minutes of the September, 1987 meeting of the Council on Teacher Education and Certification (CTEC) Committee on Alternative Teacher Preparation note that "the shortage will be exacerbated by recent changes in federal laws concerning the early identification and intervention programs for 3-5 year olds, including kindergarten programs." The use of emergency certificates may be justified under unusual circumstances. However, emergency certificates are not the preferred method of dealing with long-run teacher shortages. Teachers who hold emergency certificates do not have the same expertise as teachers who have become certified through the usual channels. Moreover, widespread use of emergency certificates circumvents the certification and endorsement system established to ensure that teachers are properly trained in the areas they teach.

Kentucky has also dealt with teacher shortages by staffing classes with out-of-field teachers. Department of Education statistics on the number of classes taught by teachers who do not have a major or a minor in the relevant specialty area indicate that in the 1987-88 school year, 662 secondary school science classes were offered by instructors teaching outside of their specialty. At the secondary level 1,527 special education classes were taught by out-of-field teachers in the 1987-88 school year.

In addition, oversized classes are relatively common in several subjects. The Department keeps records on the number of classes attended by more than 30 students. For the 1987-88 school year, 869 secondary school science classes were attended by more than 30 students.

Alternative Certification Programs Can Reduce Teacher Shortages and Maintain Quality

To overcome the pitfalls of emergency certification, states are designing programs to assist qualified individuals who lack education training to become teachers. SREB states comprise half of all the states in the country that have implemented alternative certification programs. According to an SREB report, just over one thousand persons became certified under alternative certification programs in 8 states in 1986-87. (A description of the University of Louisville's alternative certification program is included in Chapter II.)

Some states have started public relations campaigns to attract non-teaching professionals and students into the teaching force. The NSBA report states that public relations campaigns of this sort have been implemented in California, Hawaii, and Nevada. During the past year, Ashland Oil Company has aired television commercials in Kentucky aimed at elevating the status of teachers and attracting individuals to the profession.

Kentucky Offers Scholarships or "Forgivable Loans" to Increase the Supply of New Teachers

In an effort to attract students, a number of states have started to offer scholarships or "forgivable" loans to students who wish to pursue a career in education. These loan programs permit students to repay their loans by teaching in the state's school system for a certain amount of time. Frequently, forgivable loan programs are offered to students who are willing to teach in a geographic area or a subject area experiencing teacher shortages.

The minutes of the fifth meeting of the Interim Joint Committee on Education, held on April 24, 1987, describe four financial aid programs targeted at academically gifted Kentucky students and teachers: (1) the Math/Science Incentive Loan Program, established to attract students to enter the teaching fields of mathematics and science; (2) the Teacher Scholarship Program, established as a result of legislation enacted during the 1985 Special Session; (3) the Congressional Teacher Scholarship Program, targeted at outstanding high school graduates interested in teaching; and (4) the Kentucky Distinguished Student Recognition and Scholarship Award Program, mandated by the 1986 General Assembly. Each of these programs is administered by the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority (KHEAA).

In his testimony before the committee, the Executive Director of KHEAA estimated that the unmet need for the Math/Science and Teacher Scholarship Loan Programs for the 1987-88 academic year would be \$1,947,500. Inadequate funding caused 87 eligible candidates for these programs to be denied awards in 1986-86 and 61 students to be denied awards for the 1987-88 school year. As of the committee meeting, 227 teachers in the math/science fields were repaying their obligations through teaching service. The Executive Director further testified that funding problems meant denying scholarships to 187 potentially eligible students in the Teacher Scholarship Program. The 1988 General Assembly did not approve funding for the Kentucky Distinguished Scholars Program.

The College Board was tentative in its conclusions about the effectiveness of loan forgiveness programs. Citing a study conducted by the College Board, the NSBA report claims that 28 states, including Kentucky, have now implemented these types of forgivable loan incentives. The College Board asserted, however, that the students who received the scholarships or loans already intended to become teachers. The College Board also found that several students in Kentucky were not able to obtain jobs after graduation because the positions were filled by teachers teaching outside of their field of certification.

Scholarships or loans for teacher retraining in subject areas with shortages is another approach. According to a 1986 survey conducted by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 9 states, including Kentucky, have implemented such programs. The Office of Education for Exceptional Children in Kentucky's Department of Education offers a program to reimburse certified teachers who choose to retrain for special education positions.

Kentucky's Beginning Internship Program May Reduce New Teacher Drop-Out Rates

In its report on teacher supply and demand, the Rand Corporation cited evidence that the turnover rate is especially high for beginning teachers. States and local school districts have increasingly shown interest in improving the experience of teaching, particularly for new teachers. In many of these programs, experienced teachers offer guidance aimed at improving teaching skills and reducing the stress associated with one's early experiences in the classroom. With these objectives in mind, the General Assembly established Kentucky's "Beginning Teacher Internship Program" in 1984.

Monitoring Kentucky's Supply and Demand

Currently, no state agency projects the supply and demand of teachers on an on-going basis. Information on supply and demand could be used for several important purposes. State education policymakers could use these statistics to develop policies for ameliorating supply and demand problems before they reach critical proportions in specific subjects and in certain geographical areas. Furthermore, supply and demand projections could be used to advise prospective teachers of job market opportunities.

Conducting Supply and Demand Studies Is Costly and Tenuous

Conducting a study of supply and demand is a massive endeavor requiring adequate staffing and funding. Even after months of data collection and analysis, studies of this nature are frequently criticized on methodological grounds. (See Appendix F for further discussion on problems associated with supply and demand studies.) Projections of supply and demand are necessarily based upon a number of debatable assumptions about demographic trends.

The Rand Corporation report outlined the main data elements needed for a comprehensive study of supply and demand:

- Reliable counts of teachers and enrollments by grade level in all public and private schools;
- Estimates of numbers of teachers by field and certification status, and source of supply;
- Estimates of teacher shortages by field;
- Teacher turnover by field;
- Data from individual teachers on their teaching assignments, qualifications, work history, demographic characteristics, marital and family status, and sources of personal and family income; and
- Follow-up data on former teachers to determine reasons for leaving, current activities, salary and income levels, and plans for reentry into teaching.

Even if accurate projections are made initially, the teacher labor market can change abruptly when new policies are implemented. Legislative and administrative mandates on class size, teacher salaries, and graduation requirements will affect the supply and demand.

Kentucky Could Benefit from Using Existing Data and Resources

Currently, not all of the data needed to make accurate projections are available in Kentucky. For instance, state education officials do not know very much about the “reserve pool” of certified teachers who are not currently working in the schools. It is not known how many of these individuals have moved out of state, chosen another profession, or died. However, a previously cited survey conducted by the National Center for Education Information indicated that this reserve pool of certified teachers is filling a significant number of teaching positions.

Some attempts have been made in the past by the DOE and the CHE to predict future supply and demand. Currently, researchers at Murray State University are examining the feasibility of projecting supply and demand statistics. However, all of these efforts have been faced with the problems mentioned earlier. Formal, in-depth efforts are very time-consuming and costly, and the end products are always open to debate.

A proactive approach to the problem requires some system for estimating supply and demand. This system would enable policymakers to anticipate the potential impact of major legislative and administrative policy changes upon supply and demand. This information would also assist the planning efforts of the DOE, the CHE, and the teacher preparation institutions. Limited information on general teacher supply and demand is currently compiled by the Kentucky Occupational Information Coordinating Council (KOICC), but these data are not sufficient for predicting specific types of shortages.

A broad-based approach to the supply and demand problem should also address the needs of Kentucky's teacher candidates. Prospective teachers could benefit from data on employment trends for recent teacher education graduates. Information on regional placements of new teachers could guide education students into geographic and subject areas where job opportunities are readily available.

The DOE, the CHE, and the KOICC have expertise and access to data sources which could provide a better view of teacher shortages in the state. Compilation of these data by one agency, with the cooperation of all, would constitute the first step towards building a data base on teacher supply and demand.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Establish a Centralized Data Base

The Department of Education, with the assistance of the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Occupational Information Coordinating Council, should compile available supply and demand related information into one centralized data base.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Report Current Employment Trends

The Department of Education, with the assistance of the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority, should publish and disseminate an annual report detailing the current employment trends of graduates from the state's teacher preparation institutions and information on available financial assistance for students who wish to pursue a career in education. Each teacher preparation institution should provide a current copy of this report to students entering a preparation program.

RECOMMENDATION 9: Study Areas of Critical Shortage

The Department of Education, the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority should study teacher supply and demand in the Commonwealth. The study should focus on how the state is currently dealing with shortages in foreign languages, mathematics, science, special education, and computer science. Furthermore, the study should examine the problems of recruiting minority teachers. Strategies for dealing with critical shortages in these areas should also be addressed. Prior to the 1990 session of the General Assembly, the Department of Education should report its findings to the Education Committee.

CHAPTER VI

THE EVALUATION OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Professional evaluators often distinguish between two types of program evaluations: process and performance evaluations. "Process evaluations" focus primarily upon the presence or absence of characteristics commonly associated with efficient and effective programs. Programs are evaluated on the extent to which they meet standards in several areas, including implementation of efficient procedures, utilization of resources, establishment of adequate working conditions, and maintenance of satisfactory relationships with other administrative units. "Performance evaluations," on the other hand, assess the effectiveness of a program by focusing upon its outcomes. Tests, archival measures, or on-the-job evaluations are used to evaluate a program's success in meeting its missions and goals.

Recently, several states have started to use "performance evaluations" to make judgments about program quality. These evaluations use outcome measures, such as passing rates on certification examinations and on-the-job evaluations, to approve programs. The performance of students and new teachers is not being used to accredit institutions or approve programs in Kentucky.

Existing Evaluations of Kentucky Teacher Preparation Programs

Kentucky's system of program approval and accreditation relies primarily on "process evaluations" conducted by state and national organizations. Currently, teacher education programs in the state are evaluated by the Council on Higher Education (CHE) and the State Board of Education (SBE). All institutions are state accredited, although some are on conditional status. Many of the institutions also submit to voluntary reviews by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Currently, all of the Commonwealth's public institutions are NCATE-approved; among the state's private institutions, Berea College and Spalding University have received accreditation from NCATE.

Recently, the SBE and NCATE have merged their reviews of institutions seeking NCATE accreditation. The joint reviews were developed, in part, to reduce the administrative demands placed on the colleges and universities during accreditation visits. Perhaps, the administrative load on the institutions could be further alleviated by coordinating the CHE's review with the reviews undertaken by the state and NCATE. Officials from the DOE and the CHE have discussed this proposal on several occasions.

CHE Reviews, Which Stress Program Need/Demand, Have Resulted in a Few Voluntary Program Terminations

The Council on Higher Education (CHE) reviews all public teacher preparation programs in Kentucky every five years. The CHE evaluation addresses the viability of all academic programs in the state, including teacher preparation programs. Reviews are undertaken to ensure that programs are needed at a given institution and that the programs

educate a reasonable number of students. The review process takes two years for a given array of programs. The CHE completed its last cycle of program reviews in November, 1987.

During the first year of the two-year cycle, institutions gather data on the CHE scheduled programs and submit a report to the CHE. During the second year, the CHE examines institutional findings, and then develops brief reports of its findings on an institutional and statewide basis. The last three months of the two-year cycle are spent reconciling the institutions' and the CHE's findings. Decisions to approve a given program are made primarily on the basis of the following criteria: enrollment trends, student credit hours, degrees conferred, retention of students, class size, and the frequency of course offerings.

The CHE examined education programs from 1983 to 1985. As far as education programs are concerned, only elementary and special education programs are reviewed as teacher preparation programs per se. Other teacher preparation programs, such as art education, are reviewed during the time when the other art programs are being examined: As of this date, no teacher preparation programs have been terminated by this process. However, institutions have chosen to terminate teacher preparation programs without terminating the non-certification portions of those programs. For instance, the teacher preparation program of the Spanish minor might be discontinued while the Spanish minor itself would continue to be offered.

The CHE is currently revising some of its review procedures. To eliminate some of the redundant data gathering on the part of institutions, the CHE is proposing to have its staff analyze data collected by the CHE for the first six months of the two year cycle. The CHE would then submit its findings to the institutions. The last six months of the cycle would be spent reconciling any discrepancies in the data noted by the institutions.

State Board of Education (SBE) and National Organization Accreditation Reviews Are the Primary Means of Ensuring Quality

The SBE accreditation and program reviews employ three sets of criteria: teacher competency standards, special standards unique to each certification category, and NCATE standards. The teacher competency standards and the certification standards are delineated in the *Kentucky Teacher Preparation and Certification Handbook*, published by the Dept. of Education, and they are discussed in Chapter II, dealing with certification.

During the 1960s, the state adopted NCATE standards for use in its own reviews. Institutions are not, however, required to obtain accreditation by NCATE. Purportedly, the purposes of the NCATE standards are: to assure the public that particular institutions meet national standards of quality; to ensure that children are served by well prepared school personnel; to advance the teaching profession through the improvement of preparation programs; and to provide a basis for reciprocity among the states in certifying school personnel. The revised NCATE standards cover 5 basic areas:

- knowledge bases for professional education

- relationship to the world of practice
- students
- faculty
- governance and resources

The language used in the NCATE standards is often imprecise. For instance, the standards frequently refer to the need for institutions to develop ‘knowledge bases.’ Yet, the standards never attempt to define this term. NCATE representatives insist that the review process should be regarded as “a professional judgment system,” not a checklist review.

The SBE review is conducted at the program level. Programs at an institution are evaluated on the extent to which they meet standards in several areas, including design of curricula, competence and utilization of faculty, library and instructional media, and physical facilities and resources. After reviewing the supporting evidence, the team votes on whether a particular standard has been met; majority vote determines the degree of compliance with the standard. Team members are instructed by the DOE to make stringent judgments in borderline cases. If a standard borders on ‘met with weakness’ and ‘not met’, team members are instructed to rate the standard as ‘not met.’ Institutions are required to write a rejoinder to the team report within thirty days of receiving it. This reply provides supporting evidence in areas where the team’s findings are disputed.

Until recently, institutions desiring NCATE accreditation were visited at the same time by teams from NCATE and the state. However, new procedures call for a joint team, composed of NCATE reviewers and DOE members of the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Preparation, to visit the institution and issue a joint report. TEC 5.0, Section 2 (1) states that “the teams shall be composed of a majority of NCATE appointees in the following proportions respectively, NCATE and state—6 and 4, 5 and 3, 4 and 3, 3 and 2—depending upon the size of the institution and the number of programs to be evaluated.” For institutions not seeking NCATE accreditation, a team composed of 5 to 10 members of the Board of Examiners shall visit the institution and issue its report. The Board is recruited by the Division of Teacher Education and Certification and appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The 36 members comprising the Board of Examiners are selected from a pool of trained teacher educators, practitioners, and other education-related professionals. The Superintendent of Public Instruction may appoint additional members to the board, but the proportionate relationship between constituencies must be maintained.

The combined State/NCATE reviews are conducted by different teams at each institution. This system may allow for differential application of standards from review to review. The DOE does not attempt to determine the reliability of the various team judgments through statistical measures. However, new training procedures conducted by the DOE attempt to provide more uniformity than in the past.

According to SBE regulations, teacher education programs can be unconditionally approved, conditionally approved with a follow-up review mandated, or denied. Regulations mandate that a letter detailing shortcomings must be sent to any institution which is either denied approval or granted an approval with stipulations. The institution must respond satisfactorily in order to receive full program approval. The SBE may grant approval with stipulations for up to three years. However, annual follow-up visits must be conducted by the DOE. At the end of the three years, the DOE may recommend full approval or denial. If the SBE denies approval, state approval for all certification programs will be withdrawn.

A new aspect of the evaluations is the role of the recently created Teacher Preparation Evaluation Audit Committee (TPEAC), a subcommittee of the SBE. TPEAC will function for the first time following the review of Morehead State University in November, 1988. This committee will review the institutional self-studies, the joint State/NCATE reports, and the institutions' rejoinders. Then, it will make recommendations based on its findings to the SBE.

The rigor of the SBE's reviews has come under criticism. A 1985 study conducted by MGT of America, raised concerns that the SBE accreditation reviews tended to be a "good ol' boy" process. MGT pointed out that the "evaluators usually include educators from other institutions whose programs may later be reviewed by a representative from the program being reviewed." In recent interviews conducted by Program Review staff, four of six education deans thought that the state reviews were "softer" or less stringent than the reviews conducted by NCATE. Officials in the DOE's Division of Certification indicate that budget cutbacks and staff losses in the Division contributed to a weakening of the review process in the early to mid-1980s. Prior to new initiatives by the DOE and SBE in 1986, some programs had not been reviewed for at least 8 years. Beginning in 1986, the SBE put new emphasis on improving the accreditation reviews. Table 9 indicates the results of reviews undertaken since 1984. The number of reviews undertaken and the increase in conditional approvals lends some support to the claim that the SBE review process has become more rigorous.

Kentucky Now Evaluates the Classroom Performance of First-year Teachers

The Beginning Teacher Internship Program was established by the 1984 General Assembly in an effort to promote the professional growth of teachers during their first year. The primary evaluation instrument used to assess beginning teachers is the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS). The FPMS provides a scoring schema for evaluators to record the frequency of 20 effective teacher behaviors and 19 ineffective teacher behaviors. The system is supported by a body of national research conducted on teacher effectiveness. The DOE is engaged in a testing and development project to revise the FPMS for application in Kentucky. It is anticipated that the modified version of this evaluation instrument will be operational before 1990.

TABLE 9
KENTUCKY ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Date of Latest Visit	Approved	Conditional Approval	Approval Pending Outcome of Visit	State Reviewing Institutional Response	Approval Denied
1988	1	2	2	0	0
1987	6 ^{a,b}	2 ^c	0	1	0
1986	6 ^d	0	0	0	0
1985	3	0	0	0	0
1984	2	0	0	0	0

a includes three institutions restored to full approval in 1988

b includes institution approved for first 5-year cycle based on pre-visits

c includes institution granted a continuation of conditional approval

d includes two institutions restored to full approval in 1987 and 1988, respectively

Data Source: Kentucky Department of Education. "Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs." (NCATE Team Reports). Frankfort: Division of Teacher Education and Certification.

In actual practice assistance and assessment is provided by a trained assessment team consisting of the principal, resource teacher (mentor), and a university faculty member or the district's instructional supervisor. The team observes the intern on three separate occasions during the year. The intern's performance is evaluated and feedback is provided to both the intern and his or her university training program. The resource teacher or mentor works with the intern throughout the year as an advisor, consultant, and supervisor. Completion of the internship is based upon the professional judgment of the committee.

Dr. Roger Pankratz and Dr. Greg Leopold, of the College of Education at Western Kentucky University, have conducted two studies on the performance of first-year interns based upon the FPMS summative instrument. Several findings are of interest:

- The performance data on Kentucky's beginning teachers are similar to those of Florida teachers across frame factors and over time.

- Both effective and ineffective behaviors tend to reduce over the first year. This pattern may be the result of a greater emphasis on eliminating ineffective behavior rather than on reinforcing effective behaviors.

- There was no correlation between interns' performance on the FPMS and their NTE scores and GPAs; and

- A system could be developed for providing feedback to Colleges of Education and to school districts but more work will have to be done before the system can be used efficiently.

**No Statewide Performance Measurement System Exists
but Some Institutions Conduct Their Own Studies**

Under the NCATE standards adopted by the SBE, teacher preparation institutions are required to evaluate teacher education programs and the graduates of those programs. NCATE Standard 6.1 states:

The institution keeps abreast of emerging evaluation techniques and engages in systematic efforts to evaluate the quality of its graduates upon completion of their programs of study and after they enter the teaching profession. This evaluation includes evidence of their performance in relation to program objectives.

NCATE Standard 6.2 states:

The institution regularly evaluates its teacher education programs and uses the results of its evaluation in the modification and improvement of those programs.

Recently, both of these standards were incorporated into NCATE's revised Standard II.B., "Relationships with Graduates."

To determine the level of compliance with NCATE standards and to find out the methods used by Kentucky's colleges and universities to evaluate teacher education programs and their graduates, Program Review staff examined State/NCATE accreditation reports. The results of this review are presented in Table 10. According to NCATE accreditation reports available for 23 of the 25 institutions reviewed by the Department of Education 14 institutions met Standard 6.1 for both basic and advanced programs; 6 institutions met Standard 6.1 with weakness for both basic and advanced programs; 1 institution met Standard 6.1 for basic programs, but not for advanced programs; and 2 failed to meet this standard for either basic or advanced programs. Meeting a standard with weakness generally meant that some form of follow-up evaluation had been conducted, but reviewers felt that the evaluation process was deficient. Deficiencies may have included the lack of a systematic process, a narrow scope to the evaluation, or the use of obsolete techniques. Failing to meet a standard generally meant either that no evaluation process existed or that the process had been conducted informally.

TABLE 10
Evaluation Ratings of NCATE
Standards 6.1 and 6.2
(1979 — 1988)

INSTITUTION	Standard 6.1		Standard 6.2	
	Met	Not met	Met	Not Met
Alice Lloyd College	X			X
Asbury College	X		X	
Bellarmino College	X		X	
Berea College	X ¹		X ²	X ³
Brescia College	X ¹		X	
Campbellsville College	X ¹		X ²	X ³
Centre College	X ¹		X ¹	
Cumberland College	X		X	
Eastern Ky. University	X		X	
Georgetown College	X ⁴	X ⁵	X ⁴	X ⁵
Ky. Christian College		X		X
Ky. State University	X		X	
Ky. Wesleyan College	X		X	
Lindsey Wilson College	N/A		N/A	
Morehead St. University	N/A		N/A	
Murray St. University	X		X	
N. Ky. University	X ⁶		X ⁶	
Pikeville College		X		X
Spalding University	X		X	
Thomas More College	X		X	
Transylvania University	X ¹		X ¹	
Union College	X			X
University of Kentucky	X ¹		X ¹	
University of Louisville	X		X	
Western Kentucky University	X		X	

Key:

¹Met, with weakness

²Met at Elementary level

³Not met at Secondary level

⁴Met for basic programs

⁵Not met for advanced programs

⁶Accreditation conducted under revised NCATE Standards, Dec. 1987.

Data Source: Kentucky Department of Education. "Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs." (NCATE Team Reports). Frankfort: Division of Teacher Education and Certification.

Examination of team evaluations indicated that 13 met Standard 6.2 for both elementary and secondary level programs, 3 institutions met Standard 6.2 with weakness for both elementary and secondary level programs, 3 institutions met Standard 6.2 for only one set of programs, and 4 institutions did not meet the standard. Meeting Standard 6.2 with weakness generally indicated that an evaluation process was in place. However, the evaluation was implemented sporadically and may not have been program specific. Failing to meet the standard generally indicated the lack of a systematic evaluation process. In some cases institutions failed to meet the standard when program data was not made available to faculty for use in program modification.

The value of conducting institutional self-evaluations is apparent after examining the accreditation reports of public and private institutions in the state. Several institutions with effective evaluation systems indicated that they made a number of favorable program changes with the feedback from self-study. For instance, one institution increased the number of field-based experiences for its students, established a media library, placed added emphasis on classroom management strategies, and offered instruction in techniques for dealing with mainstreamed children.

Potential Performance Measures for Program Approval

State level efforts to monitor the effectiveness of teacher education programs have begun to emphasize the performance of graduates. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) reports that a number of states are beginning to use outcome measures, such as passing rates on teacher certification tests and on-the-job evaluations, to determine whether programs should be approved.

Nine Southern States Are Moving Toward Using Performance Measures For Program Approval

SREB found that test scores and classroom performance are being used or will be used by Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

In the typical scenario programs are placed on probation and must implement revisions if they do not maintain a pass rate of 70 percent to 80 percent on the certification test. In a number of instances, universities have voluntarily withdrawn programs which failed to meet these standards. SREB reports that 32 programs in Florida were placed on probation in 1985-86 because less than 80 percent of their graduates attained passing scores on certification examinations. Four of the programs were withdrawn voluntarily by the institutions. In 1983, 39 programs in Georgia were placed on probation because less than 70 percent of their graduates passed certification examinations. Institutions were required to provide the Board of Regents with plans for improvement. In 1987, 10 programs were dropped at two Georgia institutions. Last year Arkansas drafted standards for program approval which require teacher preparation institutions to maintain an 80 percent pass rate on the professional education certification examination. In order for specific programs to retain their approval, the graduates of these programs must achieve an 80 percent pass rate on the respective subject area tests.

Performance Indicators Currently Available in Kentucky May Not Be Suitable for Program Approval

Valid outcome measures that are easy to administer for the purpose of program approval are not readily available at the present time. Nevertheless, some measures are available which can be used to provide the feedback necessary for effective program modifications.

One test used in other states for program approval purposes is the National Teacher Examinations (NTE), developed by the Educational Testing Service. The NTE is composed of a communication skills test, a general knowledge test, a professional knowledge test, and a number of specialty area tests. States have set different performance standards on these tests for certification and program approval purposes. Currently, Kentucky uses the NTE for certification purposes only and not for program approval.

Despite the face validity of the examinations, there is no evidence that scores on the NTE can be used to predict the quality of a teacher's performance in the classroom. A plausible explanation for this lack of "predictive validity" is that paper and pencil measures simply test one's professional knowledge and not one's ability to communicate one's subject matter, motivate students, and create an atmosphere of learning in the classroom. The Educational Testing Service is currently developing a version of the NTE which will require the teacher candidate to pass a field-based testing situation. This development holds great promise for increasing the validity of the NTE as a predictor of classroom performance. Until research has established the validity of the NTE as an indicator of quality teaching, we recommend that the NTE not be used for the purposes of program approval.

The internship program is a valuable teaching tool, but its use for program approval purposes would have drawbacks. Several pitfalls are likely to be encountered if the results of the Florida Performance Measurement System (or the Kentucky revised form) used in the internship program were used to accredit teacher preparation institutions and approve programs. The Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship Program is primarily involved in assisting first-year teachers in their professional growth at a time when they are experiencing considerable stress. While the performance of interns is evaluated on several occasions, the thrust of these evaluations is providing supportive feedback. To this date, only two individuals in the state have failed to complete the internship.

If the FPMS were used for program accreditation, the assessment team would need to maintain greater distance from the intern. The support and encouragement offered to the intern would, in all likelihood, diminish as the focus of the program was shifted. Several of the deans interviewed by Program Review staff expressed concern about whether the internship would be able to accomplish its present objectives if the assessment of interns assumed a more adversarial posture.

A related problem associated with the use of intern performance evaluations for accreditation purposes is the administration of objective evaluations. In justifying the use of intern evaluations, it is not sufficient to document the interrater reliability of the FPMS

or some other measurement instrument under the highly controlled circumstances of a validation study. If the FPMS were used for accreditation purposes, hundreds of assessment teams would be charged with the responsibility of conducting evaluations with very great political ramifications. Maintaining the reliability of team evaluations in this context would be difficult, and the potential for developing a “good ol’ boy” system of team evaluators would be substantial.

On-the-job evaluations employing valid measurement systems might hold promise for accreditation decisions, if teams of impartial observers could administer the evaluations.

Strengthening the Program Approval Process

Current state-level evaluation activities address the need or demand for programs, as evaluated by the Council on Higher Education, and the quality of program processes and resources, as evaluated by teams of experts from the DOE and National accreditation organizations. Given the character of these reviews, their reliance on professional judgments and the serious consequences of non-accreditation, strong commitment by the reviewing agencies is necessary to ensure a meaningful and fair process.

Meaningful Accreditation Reviews Should Be Based, in Part, on Performance Data

Although the state’s teacher preparation programs are currently assessed, attempts to measure program outcomes, such as the performance of graduates, are not yet a formal part of the evaluation process. State and national standards require universities to assess their outcomes. However, the **SBE** does not use outcome measures to accredit institutions or approve programs. Although current outcome measures, such as NTE scores and internship evaluations, are not the most appropriate measures upon which to base program approval, they are valuable indicators of performance and should not be ignored.

To ensure the development and maintenance of program quality, it is critical to conduct meaningful accreditation reviews based, in part, on the performance of program graduates. There is considerable variation in the degree to which public and private institutions monitor and evaluate their programs. Some institutions conduct systematic research on the graduates of their programs, using valid measurement instruments. Other institutions perform informal surveys on a sporadic basis, in an effort to meet state standards in a perfunctory manner. The DOE should exert its authority in this area by requiring all public and private institutions to undertake credible research on the quality of their teacher education programs.

State Accreditation Reviews Should Be Kept Strong

During interviews conducted by Program Review staff, four of the six deans interviewed commented that the joint state/NCATE reviews were valuable tools for the reform of teacher education programs. The consensus of these interviews was that the new joint state/NCATE reviews will provide objective evaluations and useful feedback for improving the quality of teacher education in the state. The four deans thought that the state accreditation visits (conducted without the assistance of NCATE team members) lacked rigor in their application of NCATE standards. In theory, all institutions in the

state should be capable of achieving NCATE accreditation, since the state has been using NCATE standards for a number of years. When asked to explain the discrepancy in the rigor of the two reviews, two deans interviewed by Program Review staff said that political pressures accounted for the accreditation of several mediocre programs in the state.

Strengthening the state's existing evaluations of teacher preparation programs should be a major priority of state higher education officials. The SREB reports that a number of states are conducting new initiatives in the evaluation of teacher education programs. Virginia has established a Commonwealth Center for the Education of Teachers. Staffed by educators from the University of Virginia and James Madison University, the Center will attempt to evaluate the effects of teacher education program changes upon the performance of teachers. Tennessee has created a Center of Excellence for Teacher Education Evaluation at Tennessee Technological University. The Center is charged with the design and administration of models for evaluating the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs. In West Virginia, a consortium of three institutions is developing an alternative preparation program for "second career" adults. The program's effectiveness will be studied longitudinally with the use of demographic and test score data.

Some states have recently begun to mandate NCATE accreditation for state approval of teacher education programs. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) reports that Arkansas and North Carolina have started to require NCATE accreditation for all teacher education programs. A move for mandatory NCATE accreditation is receiving some support in Tennessee and Florida. In the future Kentucky might consider mandatory NCATE accreditation for all teacher education institutions in the state.

RECOMMENDATION 10: Continue Strengthening SBE's Accreditation Process

The State Board of Education should continue its efforts to strengthen the existing accreditation and program approval process. The five-year cycle of accreditation visits should be maintained.

RECOMMENDATION 11: Coordinate CHE and SBE Program Reviews

The State Board of Education and the Council on Higher Education should coordinate their reviews of teacher preparation programs in an effort to reduce the burden placed on colleges and universities.

RECOMMENDATION 12: Develop Valid Outcome Measures for Program Approval

The State Board of Education should have the Department of Education incorporate existing performance indicators in the accreditation process and, with the assistance of the CHE, develop more valid outcome measures for inclusion in the next 5-year program accreditation cycle.

CHAPTER VII

GOVERNANCE OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION

State influence and control of the teaching profession is exercised primarily through the licensure and certification of teachers and other school personnel, and through the approval of teacher preparatory programs. Although the state has a legal responsibility for teacher education, it can delegate functional responsibilities as it sees fit. Other professions are more self-governed. Many believe that this concept of professional self-governance should apply to the teaching profession, and that every effort should be made to decrease state dominance.

Agency Roles and Responsibility

In Kentucky, the broadest and final authority for most matters concerning teacher preparation and certification rests with the State Board of Education (SBE). The SBE, in turn, relies heavily on the Council on Teacher Education and Certification (CTEC), a 33-member advisory group established by the General Assembly and appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Superintendent and his administrative agency provide staff support for the SBE and the CTEC, and have various other administrative responsibilities relative to testing and licensure.

Formal teacher preparation programs are offered by all of the State's public universities as well as seventeen private colleges. The SBE and the Council on Higher Education (CHE) play different roles in the approval of teacher education programs. The CHE monitors the duplication and viability of public teacher education programs. On the other hand, the SBE evaluates all preparation programs in the Commonwealth for compliance with state certification requirements.

The State Board of Education Has Final Authority For Most Matters Concerning Certification

The SBE has a broad mandate under KRS 156.070 for "management and control of the common schools and all programs operated in such schools." Specific authority for the certification of teachers is given under KRS 161.030, which states that:

The certification of all teachers and other school personnel is vested in the state board of education. When so certified, teachers and other school personnel shall not be required to have licensure, certification or other forms of approval from any other state agency for the performance of their respective

Additionally, KRS 161.030 asserts that only those persons who have completed teacher education programs approved by the SBE, with curricula prescribed by the CTEC and approved by the SBE, are eligible for certification. The statute gives guidelines for areas in which teacher candidates should be tested for some degree of competence. However, the SBE is authorized to select the appropriate tests, set the minimum passing scores, and determine fees for taking tests. Additionally, the SBE is given the authority to:

- revoke certificates - KRS 161.120;
- classify teachers for compensation purposes - KRS 157.390;
- publish information relating to the training and certification of teachers - KRS 156.090;
- establish, direct and maintain a statewide program of in-service teacher training - KRS 156.095; and
- develop regulations to establish a program of educational institutes for teachers - KRS 156.097.

The CTEC Has the Most Influential Role Regarding Teacher Preparation and Certification

The CTEC was created by statute to develop and recommend policies and standards relating to teacher preparation and certification to the SBE, including:

- the requirements for the preparation and certification of teachers and other professional school personnel;
- the standards and procedures for the approval of college and university programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel. (KRS 161.025)

The CTEC is a forum for exchange and debate among a broad representation of the education community. Membership is appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in accordance with guidelines set forth in KRS 161.025. The CTEC does not establish policy. It functions in an advisory capacity to the SBE. CTEC recommendations are considered by the SBE's Program Review Committee before presentation to the full SBE membership for approval.

The CTEC is the most commonly discussed component of the governance structure. Major criticisms have addressed the size and composition of the council's membership, the influence of different factions upon the decision-making process, and its lack of authority to establish rather than recommend certification policy.

The CTEC does have a large and diverse membership. The thirty-three member body is composed of:

- Deans of Education from each of the eight public universities,
- Academic Deans from three private senior colleges,
- 9 classroom teachers,
- 2 school district superintendents,
- 3 other school administrators,

- 2 members holding membership in occupational education,
- 1 member of the Kentucky branch of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers,
- 1 member of the Kentucky School Board Association,
- 1 member from the Kentucky Department of Education who represents teacher education and certification,
- 1 member from the Kentucky Department of Education representing occupational education, and
- 2 members-at-large.

The thirty-three-member advisory board to the SBE is large in comparison to the licensing boards of other professions in Kentucky. The MGT study reported that CTEC membership was three times the maximum membership of any licensure board in the state. Furthermore, it was found to have the largest membership of any comparable statutory agency in eight companion states.

A central question regarding the composition of the CTEC is the proportional representation of higher education. The eight Deans of Education from the public universities and three academic vice presidents from the independent colleges represent 33% of the CTEC membership. MGT of America, Inc. reported that the participation level of the Deans and Academic Vice Presidents was proportionally higher than their membership level in three Council activities: meeting attendance, committee chair positions and making motions. The study concluded that higher education had exercised significantly more influence over CTEC operations than their proportional representation.

The dominance of the Deans of Education may be more of a perception than a reality. The deans are members of CTEC by virtue of their positions at their respective universities. Therefore, most have been on the CTEC longer than many of the other members. Furthermore, most interviewees conceded that self-serving characterizations were no more applicable to deans than to the other constituencies on the CTEC. Reactions to criticisms of the CTEC from interviews with state education officials in the DOE, the Education and Humanities Cabinet, the SBE, and the CHE; with Deans of Education in public and independent universities; with representatives of teacher and administrator organizations; with education advocates; and with some current and former CTEC members were more positive than negative. Supporters of the current composition feel that the broad representation on the CTEC allows the formulation of policies to be a shared process among representatives of classroom teachers, higher education, local administrators, vocational educators, government officials, parents and the public.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction's Role Is More Administrative Than Policy Oriented

The Superintendent's statutory role relating to certification is limited. KRS 161.025 gives him the authority to appoint members of the CTEC. Under 704 KAR 15.020, the Superintendent is required to evaluate the proposed curriculum of each teacher education program in the state and make recommendations concerning action to the SBE. Additionally, any proposal for the development and certification of a program of preparation by the CTEC must be evaluated in writing by the office of the Superintendent, thereby giving him the authority to make personal recommendations concerning the actions of CTEC, (704 KAR 20:005). Also, the SBE has given the Superintendent responsibility for classifying teachers in their appropriate rank for purposes of compensation under the Minimum Foundation Program. Finally, he can recommend to the SBE the removal of certified personnel for reasons of "immorality, misconduct in office, incompetency or willful neglect of duty (KRS 156.132)."

The Council on Higher Education's Role Is Not Specific to Teacher Education

The CHE is the statewide coordinating agency for higher education in Kentucky. Its mission is to review all programs offered in public institutions of higher education and to engage in "analyses and research to determine the overall needs of higher education in the Commonwealth" (KRS 164.020). Accordingly, the CHE review of teacher education programs is focused on duplication and funding.

Coordination of Roles and Responsibilities

Teacher education programs in the public universities occupy a unique position in the higher education system. Unlike other university programs, teacher education is regulated through the program approval processes of two state boards. The SBE has extensive programmatic control, and the CHE and the individual institutions have fiscal (and to a lesser degree) programmatic control. Accordingly, communication and collaboration between the two is essential to the improved delivery of teacher education in Kentucky.

Systemwide Delivery of Teacher Education Is Being Reviewed In Other States

The Report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, *Educating a Profession* (1976), states that teacher training will require a higher level of resource allocation and institutional commitment than previously.

No longer can the profession condone continuation of training programs where the principal motivation is economic necessity. The price of inadequate training effort is too high. Some institutions capable of providing quality preparation in the liberal arts, but unable to offer adequate professional programs, will seek collaborative relationships with other institutions where resources are available. These collaborative

relationships could insure a high level of quality in professional preparation. The profession must encourage more approaches of this type if quality control in teacher education is to improve.

Because of concerns regarding insufficient coordination of planning and program development between public and private higher education institutions, and local schools and their umbrella bodies, higher education has been taking a more active role in teacher education reform.

According to the SREB, higher education governing or coordinating boards in several states have conducted academic program reviews of teacher education programs in addition to the regular program approval process. Some of these reviews have been conducted jointly between the higher education board and the elementary and secondary board and have looked at factors such as enrollment, duplication, productivity and quality in the teacher education programs. Institutional recommendations from these reviews have included strengthening college and school involvement, eliminating unproductive programs, and increasing the involvement of the education faculty with the faculty of other disciplines. System-wide recommendations have included strengthening the core curriculum for all students, reviewing programs for their direct relevancy to teaching assignments and reviewing the role of community colleges in the delivery of teacher education.

Perhaps the most acclaimed of these reviews was the one undertaken in North Carolina, where the Board of Governors of the university system evaluated the quality, productivity and need of all baccalaureate, master's and doctoral teacher education programs in the university system. Other components of this comprehensive review included:

- the development of a set of priorities, policies and procedures for the establishment of new teacher education programs;
- cooperation with the state board of education in the revision of licensing and program approval standards and procedures;
- an emphasis on improved access to existing university graduate programs in education and leadership development; and
- the establishment of research and development, technical assistance and demonstration programs in the area of teacher education.

Collaboration Between Higher Education and Elementary and Secondary Education is Improving in Kentucky

At one time, the ties between higher education and elementary and secondary education in Kentucky were more formal. For example, prior to 1972, the Superintendent of Public Instruction was chairman of the Board of Regents of the regional institutions. Currently the executive director of the CHE is an ex-officio, non-voting member of the SBE.

Until recently, communication between the State Board of Education and the Council on Higher Education was tenuous. However, to the credit of both organizations, the lines of communication are re-opening. For example, a member of the CHE is now a part of the SBE/NCATE review team. In addition, CHE and SBE staff are collaborating on developing an expanded data base on teachers and teacher education.

Previous recommendations in this report apply to two areas in which the CHE, the SBE and the DOE have a common interest: evaluation of teacher education programs and compilation of data on teacher supply and demand. Additional coordination is necessary in another area of somewhat overlapping responsibility. Teacher education programs must be approved by both the SBE and the CHE before they can be offered in the public universities. Program approval by the SBE is based on adherence to state certification requirements. On the other hand, program approval by the CHE is based on need and fiscal viability. Conflicts may arise when the SBE establishes new certification categories and program requirements which have serious budget implications without an assessment from the CHE as to whether there are adequate resources for these changes.

The SBE has outlined criteria by which the Superintendent of Public Instruction is to evaluate CTEC proposals for new preparation programs before submission to the SBE for approval. One of the criteria is that:

There is sufficient demand for the training for this position to warrant the development of preparation — certification programs at one (1) or more Kentucky teacher education institutions and for sustaining these programs over a period of several years. (704 KAR 20:005(3))

Sufficient demand, as used in the regulation, should be considered in conjunction with the fiscal implications of programmatic requirements on the higher education system. The CHE, in its role as a coordinating body for the state's public higher education institutions, and with its working relationship with the Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities, is in the best position to advise the SBE and the Superintendent in this regard.

RECOMMENDATION 13: SBE and CHE Coordination

The State Board of Education should amend 704 KAR 20:005 to require that "determination of sufficient demand for training for a position" be made in consideration with a statement from the Executive Director of the Council on Higher Education on resources available for establishment of a new program or programs in teacher education colleges.

Alternatives to the Governance Structure

Several responsibilities and activities are involved in the "governance" of the teaching profession. These include:

- entry and removal from the profession

- educational standards and requirements
- continuing education requirements
- examination and testing for licensure
- career advancement and compensation opportunities
- ethical and performance standards

In Kentucky, each of these governance aspects for the teaching profession is controlled by state government. For example, the SBE controls entry into the profession by establishing certification requirements. Likewise, the statutes establish revocation guidelines and give the Superintendent power to recommend and the SBE power to revoke certifications.

The SBE, with the advice of the CTEC, establishes educational standards and continuing education requirements. Examinations are given by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Department of Education; and career advancement and compensation opportunities are statutorily established in the ranking system.

Many feel that the state should develop a means by which the organized teaching profession has more input into governance responsibilities and activities. Proponents of increased self-governance by the profession argue that the low profile in establishing standards for entry and continuation in the profession limits the ability to attract and retain quality persons.

Some States Have Established Teacher Standards Boards To Increase Self-Governance

In general terms, a state teacher professional standards board is a formal body, primarily composed of practicing teachers, which governs all or several aspects of the teaching profession. State professional standards boards may be either autonomous or quasi-autonomous. Autonomous boards generally have statutory or regulatory authority to govern all levels of participation in the teaching profession. Quasi-autonomous boards have limited authority and generally advise or make recommendations concerning certification or standards to other policy making bodies. In the article "States Must Create Teaching Standards Boards", *Education Week*, (January 11, 1989), Arthur Wise contends that more important to the success of a board is:

the scope of its authority, the size and quality of its staff, the appropriateness of its budget in relation to its task, and the seriousness with which it is taken by those in authority.

Wise also states that Minnesota and Oregon have had teacher professional standards boards for several years and that "variants of professional standards boards for teachers have been enacted in Nevada, Michigan, Montana, and West Virginia." Summary information on states with standards boards or commissions that have at least 50 percent

teacher representation, but are not necessarily teacher professional standards boards, is presented in Appendix G.

Kentucky Has Several Options For Increasing Teacher Governance of The Profession

The Council on Teacher Education and Certification is a professional body. With the possible exceptions of the two members-at-large and the representative of the Kentucky Branch of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, every member is associated with professional education. Nevertheless, Kentucky could increase the governance role of organized teaching by one or more of these means:

- vest final authority for some or all matters relating to teacher education, certification and program approval in the Council on Teacher Education and Certification instead of the State Board of Education;
- reduce the number of one or more constituencies represented on the Council on Teacher Education and Certification to the point where the composition of the body is predominantly classroom teachers; or
- replace the Council on Teacher Education and Certification with a professional body composed predominately of teachers with approval or advisory responsibility for some or all matters relating to teacher education, certification, and program approval.

CHAPTER VIII

COMMITTEE ACTION

The Program Review and Investigations Committee's discussion of the staff report on Kentucky's Teacher Preparation System covered portions of three committee meetings. The draft report was presented on March 6, 1989. State agencies affected by the study recommendations, and other interested parties, testified at committee meetings on March 6, April 3, and May 1, 1989. Final consideration was given to staff and committee recommendations and the draft report on May 1, 1989. Appendix H contains a Recommendation Worksheet which reflects amendments and action on all recommendations.

At the April 3, 1989 meeting, the Committee adopted recommendations numbered one, three, four, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven and twelve as presented by staff. Recommendation number five was adopted as amended.

At the May 1, 1989 meeting, the Committee adopted recommendations numbered two and six as amended, and recommendation numbered thirteen as presented by staff. Four additional recommendations were proposed by members of the Committee:

RECOMMENDATION 14: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

The General Assembly should fund, and the State Board of Education should develop and administer a pilot program to establish three professional development centers for a three year period. The regional professional development centers would provide training programs that would allow teachers to complete the in-service requirements for recertification, and would also establish a level of training programs suitable as an option to the traditional Master's or Fifth-year Program. An independent evaluation should be part of the program. An evaluation report should be forwarded to the General Assembly within six months of the program's end.

The plan and budget proposal developed by the State Board of Education should be submitted to the Interim Joint Committee on Education prior to the 1990 Regular Session of the General Assembly.

RECOMMENDATION 15: PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

A new section of KRS Chapter 161 should be established to create a professional standards board responsible for the issuance, suspension, renewal and revocation of certificates for Kentucky teachers and regulation of the Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship Program. The professional standards board should be an autonomous body with members appointed by the Governor. The membership should be composed predominantly of teachers, with representation from the following: school administrators, teacher educators, higher education representatives and lay representation.

RECOMMENDATION 16: PART-TIME SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTORS

A new section of KRS Chapter 161 should be created requiring the State Board of Education to establish regulations governing the qualifications and the utilization of persons from other professions with demonstrated expertise in their respective areas of education, training or professional experience. These regulations should specify the minimum essential competencies which must be demonstrated by any person seeking certification as a part-time instructor of subjects related to his or her areas of expertise and should establish and require competency tests if deemed necessary.

Holders of this certificate should be employed on an annual contract basis and should not be eligible for continuing service status or for retirement provisions.

Local school boards could contract with such certificated instructors for part-time services on an hourly, daily or other periodic basis as best meets the needs of the board.

RECOMMENDATION 17: REVIEW OF CERTIFICATION CATEGORIES

The State Board of Education, the Council on Higher Education, and the Council on Teacher Education and Certification should establish a task force composed of members selected from each body to review all existing specialized certification categories for teachers and other school personnel. The membership should also include the Superintendent of Public Instruction. On or before November 1, 1989, the task force should submit a report to the State Board, the Council on Teacher Education and Certification and the Legislative Research Commission regarding the continuation, discontinuation or combination of specific certification categories.

All four Committee recommendations were adopted.

The staff report was adopted by the Committee for submission to the Legislative Research Commission and the Interim Joint Committee on Education.

APPENDIX A

RESULTS OF

SURVEY OF KENTUCKY TEACHERS ON

THE PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS

Teacher Compensation

During the past decade, states have adopted a wide range of teacher compensation policies aimed at attracting and retaining talented individuals in the classroom.

1. Which of the following methods of compensating teachers do you prefer? (Check one)

- 47.9% The current ranking system (i.e., Rank II in 10 years followed by Rank I).
 - 23.6% The current ranking system modified by at least one extra rank beyond Rank I.
 - 10.9% A performance-based ranking system based upon an employee evaluation program.
 - 4.7% A career ladder system.
 - 12.9% Other (Please explain)
-

2. CHECK THOSE BLANKS BELOW WITH WHICH YOU AGREE WHEN THEY ARE ADDED TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT: Performance-based compensation systems..."

- 17.4% enhance the status of teachers.
- 76.2% are difficult to administrate.
- 20.0% motivate teachers to teach better.
- 54.% create unhealthy competition among teachers.
- 44.7% reduce morale among teachers.
- 72.4% are generally based on subjective and questionable assessments of performance.

In-Service Programs

Currently, Kentucky law provides for 4 days of in-service education for teachers in the Commonwealth.

3. How useful are the current in-service programs in your district? (PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR JUDGMENT)

0	1	2	3
not at all useful	not very useful	somewhat useful	useful
4.2%	24.7%	45%	26.1%

4. "In-service programs have given me the opportunity to..." (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

42.7% become more knowledgeable about my specialty area
 48.9% improve my teaching skills
 38.3% develop better classroom management skills
 18.8% catch up on my paperwork
 38.5% meet with parents
 17.9% other _____

5. "I would prefer that in-service programs be scheduled..."
 (RANK EACH OF THE FIVE TIME ARRANGEMENTS IN ORDER OF YOUR PREFERENCE.)
 WITH 1 = MOST PREFERRED AND 5 = LEAST PREFERRED.)

MEAN RATINGS

2.9 after school (with allowances for time spent).
 2.9 at a specific time during the school day.
 1.7 by closing school for one or two days on a regular basis.
 2.9 during the summer (with allowances for time spent).
 4.5 on weekends (with allowances for time spent).

6. In-service programs frequently cover a wide range of topics and objectives. Listed below are several possible objectives for in-service programs. On the space provided by each objective, please indicate the number which best reflects the degree of utility each type of in-service program would have for you. Use the following scale in making your judgments:

In-service programs designed:

_____ to meet my needs for professional development as identified by my performance evaluations.			
0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
9.6%	18.6%	39.3%	32.5%

_____ to improve my knowledge in my specialty area.			
0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
4.0%	9.0%	22.6%	64.4%

_____ to improve my teaching skills.			
0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
3.0%	11.0%	29.4%	56.5%

_____ to focus upon contemporary and social issues in education.

0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
7.0%	26.1%	42.9%	24.0%

_____ to attend to organizational and administrative matters in my school or school district.

0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
5.1%	25.7%	32.5%	26.7%

_____ to learn effective techniques in classroom management.

0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
5.7%	14.1%	34.8%	45.3%

7. Have you had an opportunity to make suggestions regarding the design and content of in-service days ? (CHECK ONE)

Yes 74.1% NO 25.9%

8. What suggestions do you have for improving the value of in-service days?

Continuing Education Requirements

Currently, teachers must attain a master's degree or an equivalent program of study within 10 years.

9. To what degree does the "master's degree program" or its equivalent improve one's mastery over his/her specialty area?

1	2	3	4	5
does not				greatly
improve				improves
8.3%	18.5%	30.2%	28.3%	14.8%

10. To what degree does the "master's degree program" or its equivalent improve one's teaching ability?

1	2	3	4	5
does not improve				greatly improves
13.7%	23.9%	28.9%	23.9%	9.5%

11. State policies should be changed to: (Check all that apply)

18.4% discontinue the master's degree as a requirement for a second-stage certificate.

20.8% discontinue the Fifth-Year Program as a requirement for a second-stage certificate.

21.9% award the second-stage (Rank II) certificate to teachers who successfully complete the Beginning Teacher's Program.

9.1% replace the current requirement of a master's degree for a Rank II classification with a career ladder program.

50.2% require that continuing education for a teacher be based upon a professional development plan specifically developed for each individual teacher.

_____ other (Please explain)

If you have taken master's level courses both on and off a college or university campus, please answer question 12. If not, please skip to question 13.

12. How would you rate the quality of off-campus courses relative to those conducted on-campus ? (Check one)

5.8% off-campus courses are of higher quality

76.3% off-campus courses are of the same quality

17.9% off-campus courses are of lower quality

13. What changes would you recommend concerning the master's degree program or its equivalent?

Teacher Preparation and Certification

In recent years admission to teacher preparation programs has been contingent upon earning a 2.5 GPA (4 point scale) and passing a basic skills test.

14. Are minimum standards for admission to a teacher preparation program a good idea? (Check one)

Yes 94.4% No 5.6%

Effective January 1, 1985, a candidate completing an approved teacher preparation program must pass the National Teacher Examinations (NTE) and successfully complete the one-year beginning internship program to qualify for certification in Kentucky.

15. Should an exam be given as part of the certification process? (Check one)

Yes 59% No 41%

16. If 'Yes', should the cut-off score for passing the NTE or an equivalent exam be: (Check one)

63.5% kept at the current level (the 15th percentile)
1.1% lowered to permit more students to pass
35.3% raised to permit fewer students to pass

The primary goal of the Beginning Teacher Internship Program is to help new teachers experience a successful first year in the classroom. The program is designed to strengthen positive teaching skills and help the intern teacher recognize behaviors which are counter productive for learning.

17. Have you completed the current internship program? (Check one)

Yes 12.5% No 87.5%

18. Have you ever been a resource teacher for a beginning intern? (Check one)

Yes 13.7% No 86.3%

19. How effective is the current teacher internship program?

0	1	2	3
not at all effective	not very effective	somewhat effective	effective
3.5%	13.9%	53.7%	28.8%

20. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the internship program?

Strengths: _____

Weaknesses: _____

21. How would you improve the internship program?

22. Education majors must take many types of courses. In addition to classes in their specialty areas, education majors must take the following types of courses: teaching methods; human growth and development; curriculum planning and development; and 'foundation' courses. We are interested in how worthwhile these types of classes are for the undergraduate education curriculum. On the space provided by each of the five types of courses, please indicate the number which best reflects its value for the undergraduate education curriculum. Please use the following scale in making your judgements:

_____ one's specialty area courses (e.g., English courses for those specializing in the teaching of English)

0	1	2	3
not at all valuable	not very valuable	somewhat valuable	valuable
0	2%	6.4%	91.7%

_____ teaching methods courses (e.g., methods of teaching science, math, etc.)

0	1	2	3
not at all valuable	not very valuable	somewhat valuable	valuable
1.1%	9.5%	26.8%	62.5%

_____ human growth/development courses (e.g., adolescent psychology, development of young children, etc.)

0	1	2	3
not at all valuable	not very valuable	somewhat valuable	valuable
1.8%	11.5%	40.6%	46.2%

_____ curriculum planning/development courses (e.g., middle school problems and curricula, program development in early childhood, etc.)

0	1	2	3
not at all valuable	not very valuable	somewhat valuable	valuable
3.8%	16.5%	41.8%	37.9%

_____ 'foundation' courses (e.g., the history, ethics, and legal requirements of education)

0	1	2	3
not at all valuable	not very valuable	somewhat valuable	valuable
7.2%	29.8%	38.3%	24.7%

23. In the space provided, please assign a percentage for the amount of time which should be devoted to each of the five types of courses (as defined in question 22) in the undergraduate education curriculum. Please be certain that the percentages add up to 100%.

	K-4 Teachers	5-8 Teachers	9-12 Teachers
% one's specialty area courses	39.5%	45.7%	54.8%
% teaching methods courses	21.8%	19.7%	16.7%
% human growth/development courses	13.9%	12.5%	10.0%
% curriculum planning/development courses	13.2%	11.5%	10.1%
% 'foundation' courses	11.6%	10.6%	8.1%

24. What changes would you recommend in the current undergraduate teacher education programs?

25. To what degree is the current system of certification and endorsement categories flexible or restrictive in allowing teachers to teach courses in areas SIMILAR, BUT NOT IDENTICAL, to their specialty areas?

1 restrictive	2 somewhat restrictive	3 neutral	4 somewhat flexible	5 flexible
14.8%	28.4%	27.5%	24.5%	4.7%

26. Three statements are listed below concerning the current structure of certification and endorsement categories. On the space provided by each statement, indicate the number which best reflects your level of agreement. Please use the following scale in making your judgements:

_____ "The current system of certification and endorsement categories should be kept exactly as it is."				
1 strongly disagree	2 disagree	3 undecided	4 agree	5 strongly agree
6.9%	25.7%	38%	23%	6.3%

_____ "More certification and endorsement categories should be added to the current classification system."

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree
11%	23%	35.5%	26.3%	4.1%

_____ "Some of the more specialized categories should be combined into broader categories."

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree
4.8%	15.8%	33.5	37.7%	8.3%

27. What changes would you recommend regarding the current certification categories or requirements?

Alternative Preparation/Certification Programs

Some states have authorized "alternative certification" programs to prepare graduates who were not education majors for certification. These programs require the completion of an abbreviated course of study in professional education courses and an intensive working internship.

28. Do you support or oppose alternative preparation/certification as a legitimate entry route into the teaching profession? (Check one)

Support 40.2% Oppose 39.9% No Opinion 19.9%

Please explain _____

29. If you "Support" alternative preparation/certification programs, should they be restricted to areas with a critical teacher shortage? (Check one)

Yes 28.8% No 51.7% Not Sure 19.6%

Additional Comments

Demographic Information

Gender: Male 26.1% Female 73.9%

Total number of years teaching: Median = 14 years

Year in which you received your initial certification: ---

At which university or college did you receive your undergraduate training?

At which university or college have you received graduate level training?

Please check the category which best reflects the size of the school district in which you teach.

Under 1,000 students: 10.5%
1,000 to 1,999 students: 16.7%
2,000 to 3,999 students: 22.6%
4,000 to 6,999 students: 15.8%
Above 7,000 students: 34.4%

Please check the grade levels of the school in which you teach.

K - 4: 42.2%
5 - 8: 44.2%
9 - 12: 34.0%

Please check your teaching rank.

Rank I: 34.1%
Rank II: 50.9%
Rank III: 15.0%

In what areas are you certified to teach in Kentucky?

In what areas is your certificate endorsed?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Additional Space for Open-Ended Questions

APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF SURVEY OF KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATORS ON THE PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS

FALL, 1988

CARD: / 1 / ID: 102-105
101

Teacher Preparation and Certification

In recent years admission to teacher preparation programs has been contingent upon earning a 2.5 GPA (4 point scale) and passing a basic skills test.

1. Are minimum standards for admission to a teacher preparation program a good idea? (Check one)

Yes 94.5% No 2.0% Not Sure 3.6% / /
106

2. How effective is the 2.5 GPA requirement at "screening out" candidates who do not have the potential to become good teachers?

(PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR JUDGMENT)

0	1	2	3	/ <u> </u> /
not at all	not very	somewhat	effective	
effective	effective	effective		107
2.6%	14.4%	64.9%	18.1%	

3. How effective is the basic skills test at "screening out" candidates who do not have the potential to become good teachers.

0	1	2	3	/ <u> </u> /
not at all	not very	somewhat	effective	
effective	effective	effective		108
2.9%	13.2%	63.7%	20.2%	

Effective January 1, 1985, a candidate completing an approved teacher preparation program must pass the National Teacher Examinations (NTE) and successfully complete the one-year beginning internship program to qualify for certification in Kentucky.

4. Should an exam be given as part of the certification process?
(Check one)

Yes 65.1% No 23.0% Not Sure 11.9% 109- / /

5. If you answered 'Yes' to question 4, please answer question 5. If not, skip to question 6.

Should the cut-off score for passing the NTE or an equivalent exam be: (Check one)

62.3% kept at the current level (the 15th percentile)
1.3% lowered to permit more students to pass
36.4% raised to permit fewer students to pass 110- / ____ /

The primary goal of the Beginning Teacher Internship Program is to help new teachers experience a successful first year in the classroom. The program is designed to strengthen positive teaching skills and help the intern teacher recognize behaviors which are counterproductive for learning.

6. How effective is the current teacher internship program?

0	1	2	3	/ ____ /
not at all	not very	somewhat	effective	111
effective	effective	effective		
1.0%	7.4%	38.3%	53.4%	

7. Have you ever served on a Beginning Internship Committee?

Superintendents	Yes <u>12.4%</u>	No <u>87.6%</u>	112- / ____ /
Primary Principals	Yes <u>84.4%</u>	No <u>15.6%</u>	112- / ____ /
Secondary Principals	Yes <u>82.0%</u>	No <u>18.0%</u>	112- / ____ /
Instructional Supervisor	Yes <u>37.8%</u>	No <u>62.2%</u>	112- / ____ /

8. If you answered 'Yes' to question 7, please answer question 8. If not, skip to question 9.

Do you feel that there is a conflict between your role as a mentor and your role as an evaluator of beginning interns?

Yes 78.8% No 92.2% 113- / ____ /

Please

explain: _____

9. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the internship program?

(Extra space for all open-ended questions is available on the last page of this survey.)

Strengths: _____

Weaknesses: _____

10. How would you improve the internship program?

11. Education majors must take many types of courses. In addition to classes in their specialty areas, education majors must take the following types of courses: teaching methods; human growth and development; curriculum planning and development; and 'foundation' courses. We are interested in how worthwhile these types of classes are for the undergraduate education curriculum. In the space provided by each of the five types of courses, please indicate the number which best reflects its value for the undergraduate education curriculum. Please use the following scale in making your judgments:

_____ one's specialty area courses (e.g., English courses for those specializing in the teaching of English)				114- / ____ /
0	1	2	3	
not at all	not very	somewhat	valuable	
valuable	valuable	valuable	valuable	
0.11%	1.33%	10.83%	87.74%	
_____ teaching methods courses (e.g., methods of teaching science, math, etc.)				115- / ____ /
0	1	2	3	
not at all	not very	somewhat	valuable	
valuable	valuable	valuable	valuable	
1.43%	3.33%	24.14%	71.15%	
_____ human growth/development courses (e.g., adolescent psychology, development of young children, etc.)				116- / ____ /
0	1	2	3	
not at all	not very	somewhat	valuable	
valuable	valuable	valuable	valuable	
0%	5.41%	32.31%	62.28%	
_____ curriculum planning/development courses (e.g., middle school problems and curricula, program development in early childhood, etc.)				117- / ____ /
0	1	2	3	
not at all	not very	somewhat	valuable	
valuable	valuable	valuable	valuable	
1.03%	9.56%	38.89%	50.53%	
_____ 'foundation' courses (e.g., the history, ethics, and legal requirements of education)				118- / ____ /
0	1	2	3	
not at all	not very	somewhat	valuable	
valuable	valuable	valuable	valuable	
1.51%	18.07%	43.64%	36.78%	

12. In the space provided, please assign a percentage for the amount of time which should be devoted to each of the five types of courses, as defined in question 11, in the undergraduate education curriculum. Please be certain that the percentages add up to 100%.

41.6 % one's specialty area courses	119-120-121- / / / /
21.9 % teaching methods courses	122-123-124- / / / /
13.1 % human growth/development courses	125-126-127- / / / /
12.6 % curriculum planning/development courses	128-129-130- / / / /
11.1 % 'foundation' courses	131-132-133- / / / /

13. What changes would you recommend in the current undergraduate teacher education programs?

14. To what degree is the current system of certification and endorsement categories flexible or restrictive in allowing teachers to teach courses in areas similar, but not identical, to their specialty areas?

1	2	3	4	5	/ /
restrictive	somewhat restrictive	neutral	somewhat flexible	flexible	134
24.5%	38.5%	14.1%	19.6%	3.4%	

15. Three statements are listed below concerning the current structure of certification and endorsement categories. On the space provided by each statement, indicate the number which best reflects your level of agreement. Please use the following scale in making your judgments:

"The current system of certification and endorsement categories should be kept exactly as it is."					135- / /
1	2	3	4	5	
strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree	
15.5%	44.2%	20.4%	17.2%	2.9%	

"More certification and endorsement categories should be added to the current classification system."					136- / /
1	2	3	4	5	
strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree	
23.6%	4.2%	21.1%	20.3%	30.2%	

_____ "Some of the more specialized categories should be combined into broader categories."					137- / ____ /
1	2	3	4	5	
strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree	
4.5%	9.2%	18.7%	46.2%	21.4%	

16. What changes would you recommend regarding the current certification categories or requirements?

Continuing Education Requirements

Currently, teachers must attain a master's degree or an equivalent program of study within 10 years.

17. To what degree does the "master's degree program" or its equivalent improve a teacher's mastery over his/her specialty area?

1	2	3	4	5	/ ____ /
does not improve				greatly improves	138
4.4%	20.4%	36.6%	28.3%	10.3%	

18. To what degree does the "master's degree program" or its equivalent improve a teacher's teaching ability?

1	2	3	4	5	/ ____ /
does not improve				greatly improves	139
6.2%	26.9%	36.9%	23.5%	6.9%	

19. State policies should be changed to: (Check all that apply)

<u>14.7%</u> discontinue the master's degree as a requirement for a second-stage certificate.	140- / ____ /
<u>20.3%</u> discontinue the Fifth-Year Program as a requirement for a second-stage certificate.	141- / ____ /
<u>7.6%</u> award the second-stage (Rank II) certificate to teachers who successfully complete the Beginning Teacher's Program.	142- / ____ /
<u>11.8%</u> replace the current requirement of a master's degree for a Rank II classification with a career ladder program.	143- / ____ /

50.9% require that continuing education for a teacher	144- / ____ /
be based upon a professional development plan	
specifically developed for each individual teacher.	145- / ____ /
11.8% other (Please explain)	

20. What changes would you recommend concerning the master's degree program or its equivalent?

In-Service Programs

Currently, Kentucky law provides for 4 days of in-service education for teachers in the Commonwealth.

21. In-service programs frequently cover a wide range of topics and objectives. Listed below are several possible objectives for in-service programs. On the space provided by each objective, please indicate the number which best reflects its utility for an in-service program. Please use the following scale in making your judgments:

In-service programs should be designed:

_____	to meet teachers' needs for professional development as identified by their performance evaluations.	146- / ____ /	
0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
3.0%	11.5%	31.6%	53.9%

_____	to improve teachers' knowledge of their specialty areas.	147- / ____ /	
0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
3.1%	11.5%	32.7%	52.8%

_____	to improve teachers' teaching skills.	148- / ____ /	
0	1	2	3
not at all	not very	somewhat	
useful	useful	useful	useful
1.2%	7.5%	21.8%	69.5%

_____	to focus upon contemporary and social issues in education.	149- / ____ /
0	1	2
not at all	not very	somewhat
useful	useful	useful
4.0%	26.1%	48.7%
		3
		useful
		21.2%

_____	to attend to organizational and administrative matters in the school or school district.	150- / ____ /
0	1	2
not at all	not very	somewhat
useful	useful	useful
16.7%	28.1%	30.0%
		3
		useful
		25.2%

_____	to learn effective techniques in classroom management.	151- / ____ /
	*4.66% did not respond	
0	1	2
not at all	not very	somewhat
useful	useful	useful
0.8%	4.3%	20.4%
		3
		useful
		70.0%

22. "I would prefer that in-service programs for teachers be scheduled: (Please rank each of the 5 time arrangements in order of your preference. 1 = most preferred; 5 = least preferred.)

MEAN RATINGS

<u>3.1</u>	after school (with allowances for time spent)."	152- / ____ /
<u>3.6</u>	at a specific time during the school day."	153- / ____ /
<u>1.9</u>	by closing school for one or two days on a regular basis."	154- / ____ /
<u>2.5</u>	during the summer (with allowances for time spent)."	155- / ____ /
<u>4.1</u>	on weekends (with allowances for time spent)."	156- / ____ /

23. What suggestions do you have for improving the value of in-service days?

Teacher Competency

24. Competent teachers use a variety of important skills and knowledge bases during their daily classroom instruction. On the 6 competency dimensions presented below, please rate the teachers in your school or school district. Make separate ratings for teachers with 5 or more years of experience and for teachers with less than 5 years of experience. In the space provided indicate the number which best reflects your judgment. Use the following scale in making your judgments:

1	2	3	4	5
poor	fair	average	good	excellent

TEACHERS WITH LESS THAN 5 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE:

MEAN RATINGS

3.6 basic communication skills	157-/_/_/
3.9 knowledge of one's specialty area	158-/_/_/
3.5 ability to motivate students	159-/_/_/
3.3 classroom management skills	160-/_/_/
3.6 basic teaching methods	161-/_/_/

TEACHERS WITH MORE THAN 5 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE:

MEAN RATINGS

3.9 basic communication skills	162-/_/_/
4.2 knowledge of one's specialty area	163-/_/_/
3.6 ability to motivate students	164-/_/_/
4.0 classroom management skills	165-/_/_/
3.9 basic teaching methods	166-/_/_/

Alternative Preparation/Certification Programs

Some states have authorized "alternative certification" programs to prepare graduates who were not education majors for certification. These programs require the completion of an abbreviated course of study in professional education courses and an intensive working internship.

25. Do you support or oppose alternative preparation/certification as a legitimate entry route into the teaching profession? (Check one)

Superintendents:	Support <u>59.6%</u>	Oppose <u>27.8%</u>	No Opinion <u>12.6%</u>
Primary Principals:	Support <u>39.0%</u>	Oppose <u>43.0%</u>	No Opinion <u>18.0%</u>
Secondary Principals:	Support <u>52.3%</u>	Oppose <u>37.2%</u>	No Opinion <u>33.9%</u>
Instructional Supervisors:	Support <u>51.9%</u>	Oppose <u>33.9%</u>	No Opinion <u>14.2%</u>

Please
explain _____

26. If you "Support" alternative preparation/certification programs, should they be restricted to areas with a critical teacher shortage? (Check one)

Superintendent:	Yes <u>43.3%</u>	No <u>48.9%</u>	Not Sure <u>7.8%</u>	168-/_/_/
Primary Principals:	Yes <u>29.9%</u>	No <u>53.7%</u>	Not Sure <u>16.4%</u>	168-/_/_/
Secondary Principals:	Yes <u>35.6%</u>	No <u>44.4%</u>	Not Sure <u>20.0%</u>	168-/_/_/
Instructional Supervisors:	Yes <u>33.7%</u>	No <u>45.3%</u>	Not Sure <u>21.1%</u>	168-/_/_/

Supply and Demand of Teachers

This section is designed to provide current information on the job markets for teacher candidates.

If you are a superintendent, elementary school principal, or an instructional supervisor for elementary teachers, please complete questions 27, 28, and 29. If you are a secondary school principal or an instructional supervisor for secondary teachers, please skip to questions 30, 31, and 32.*

27. Compared to last year, how would you rate the employment opportunities for elementary teachers for the current 1988-89 teaching year?

1	2	3	4	5	/___/
much worse	worse	same	better	much better	169
.7%	11.5%	50.7%	31.8%	5.4%	

28. Compared to four years ago, how would you rate the employment opportunities for elementary teachers for the current 1988-89 teaching year?

1	2	3	4	5	/___/
much worse	worse	same	better	much better	170
2.7%	10.8%	31.1%	41.2%	14.2%	

29. Compared to the current 1988-89 teaching year, how would you rate the employment opportunities for elementary teachers for the approaching 1989-90 teaching year?

1	2	3	4	5	/___/
much worse	worse	same	better	much better	171
2.0%	9.5%	50.3%	28.6%	9.5%	

If you are a superintendent, a secondary school principal, or an instructional supervisor for secondary teachers, please complete questions 25, 26, and 27. If you are a primary school principal or an instructional supervisor for primary teachers, please skip to the final section entitled "Demographic Information."*

30. Compared to last year, how would you rate the employment opportunities for secondary teachers for the current 1988-89 teaching year?

1	2	3	4	5	/___/
much worse	worse	same	better	much better	172
2.0%	8.1%	57.6%	31.3%	1.0%	

31. Compared to four years ago, how would you rate the employment opportunities for secondary teachers for the current 1988-89 teaching year?

1	2	3	4	5	/___/
much worse	worse	same	better	much better	173
3.0%	12.1%	41.4%	35.4%	8.0%	

32. Compared to the current 1988-89 teaching year, how would you rate the employment opportunities for secondary teachers for the approaching 1989-90 teaching year?

1	2	3	4	5	/___/
much worse	worse	same	better	much better	174
2.0%	12.0%	55.0%	24.0%	7.0%	

*Ratings reflect superintendent's responses only.

CARD: / 2_ / ID: _____
201 202-205

SUPPLY AND DEMAND ESTIMATES

THE FOLLOWING SECTION IS TO BE COMPLETED ONLY BY SUPERINTENDENTS. IF YOU ARE A PRINCIPAL OR AN INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISOR, PLEASE SKIP TO THE FINAL SECTION ENTITLED "DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION".

33. Listed below are three sets of grade levels and a number of subject areas taught in most school districts. We would like you to estimate the degree of surplus or shortage of teachers for each subject area across the three sets of grade levels. Please use the following scale to make your judgments:

1	2	3	4	5
Considerable	Some	Balanced	Some	Considerable
Surplus	Surplus		Shortage	Shortage

Place the number which best reflects your judgment in the space provided. Leave the space blank if the question is not relevant or if you are unable to make a reasonable estimate.

MEAN RATINGS

SUBJECT AREAS	GRADE LEVELS TAUGHT		
	K-4	5-8	9-12
Agriculture	N/A	N/A	2.4 /206-208/
Art	3.2	3.2	3.0 /209-211/
Business	N/A	N/A	2.3 /212-214/
Computer Science	N/A	N/A	4.9 /215-217/
Driver Education	N/A	N/A	2.4 /218-220/
English	N/A	2.9	2.9 /221-223/
English (2nd Lang.)	N/A	N/A	3.8 /224-226/
Health Education	N/A	2.4	2.2 /227-229/
Home Economics	N/A	2.6	2.4 /230-232/
Industrial Educ.	N/A	N/A	3.0 /233-235/
Journalism	N/A	N/A	3.0 /236-238/
Language, French	N/A	4.0	3.8 /239-241/

Language, German	N/A	4.3	4.3 /242-244/
Language, Latin	N/A	4.5	4.5 /245-247/
Language, Spanish	N/A	3.9	3.9 /248-250/
Mathematics	N/A	3.8	3.9 /251-253/
Music, Instrumental	3.0	3.0	3.0 /254-256/
Music, Vocal	2.9	2.9	2.9 /257-259/
Physical Education	2.1	1.9	1.7 /260-262/
Science-Biology	N/A	N/A	3.4 /263-265/
Science-Chemistry	N/A	N/A	4.0 /266-268/
Science-Earth	N/A	N/A	3.5 /269-271/
Science-General	N/A	3.4	3.4 /272-274/
Science-Physics	N/A	N/A	4.4 /275-277/
Social Sciences	N/A	2.3	2.3 /278-280/

CARD: / 3 /
301

ID: 302-305

Speech	N/A	N/A	3.8 /306-308/
Special Ed., Gifted	3.9	4.0	4.0 /309-311/
Special Ed., Hearing Imp.	4.4	4.4	4.3 /312-314/
Special Ed., Learn. Dis.	4.2	4.2	4.3 /315-317/
Special Ed., Mental Handi.	4.3	4.3	4.3 /318-320/
Special Ed., Reading	3.8	3.8	3.9 /321-323/
Special Ed., Severe Handi.	4.7	4.7	4.7 /324-326/
Special Ed., Speech Disorder	4.4	4.3	4.4 /327-329/
Special Ed., Visual Impaired	4.6	4.6	4.6 /330-332/

CATEGORY OF TEACHERS

Minority Teachers	4.4	4.4	4.5 /333-335/
Substitute Teachers	4.0	4.1	4.1 /336-338/

Demographic Information

Please check the category which best describes your current position.

153 (25.5%)* Superintendent 339- / ____ /
173 (28.9%)* Primary School Principal
88 (14.7%)* Secondary School Principal
185 (30.9%)* Instructional Supervisor

Year in which you became certified for your present position:

____ 340-341- / ____ / ____ /

Were you a classroom teacher before you became an administrator?

Yes 98% No 2% 342- / ____ /

Please check the category which best reflects the size of the school district in which you work:

Under 1,000 students:	<u>13.2%</u> *
1,000 to 1,999 students:	<u>14.4%</u> *
2,000 to 3,999 students:	<u>27.6%</u> *
4,000 to 6,999 students:	<u>19.4%</u> *
Above 7,000 students:	<u>25.3%</u> *

343- / ____ /

Thank you for your cooperation.

Additional Space for Open-Ended Questions

*unweighted percentages

APPENDIX C

REQUIREMENTS FOR BACCALAUREATE DEGREE IN KENTUCKY

Component	Authority	CERTIFICATION LEVEL			
		K - 4	5 - 8	9 - 12*	
Gen. Educ.	State Inst. SBE Req	31-73 45	30-73 45	30-73 45	
Prof. Educ.**	State Inst. SBE Req.	15-46 27	15-42 18	14-38 13	
Related Studies	State Inst. SBE Req.	8-46 18	6-13 0	3-18 0	
Academic Spec.	State Inst. SBE Req.	21-30 21	48-68 48	48-54 48	AREA OF CONC.
	State Inst. SBE Req.			33-52 30	MAJOR
	State Inst. SBE Req.			21-28 24	MINOR

SOURCE: Program Review and Investigations Survey of Kentucky's
Colleges and Universities

* Requirements for major in English

** Coursework only, without student teaching

APPENDIX D

BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION
AND RECERTIFICATION

5665K

REQUIREMENT	P R O V I S I O N A L			S T A N D A R D		
	EARLY ELEMENTARY GRADES K - 4	MIDDLE GRADES GRADES 5 - 8	HIGH SCHOOL GRADES 9 - 12	EARLY ELEMENTARY GRADES K - 4	MIDDLE GRADES GRADES 5 - 8	HIGH SCHOOL GRADES 9 - 12
DEGREE	Baccalaureate Degree	Baccalaureate Degree	Baccalaureate Degree	Master's Degree or Planned Equivalent	Master's Degree or Planned Equivalent	Master's Degree or Planned Equivalent
General Education	45 Semester hours	45 Semester hours	45 Semester hours			
Professional Education	39 Semester hours (incl. 12 weeks full-time student teaching)	30 Semester hours (incl. 12 hours full-time student teaching)	25 Semester hours (incl. 12 hours full-time student teaching)	12 Semester hours based on teaching level or equivalent	12 Semester hours based on teaching level or equivalent	12 Semester hours based on teaching level or equivalent
Related Studies	18 Semester hours			6 Elective hours	6 Elective hours	6 Elective hours
Academic Specialization	one field 21 Semester hours	two fields 24 Semester hours in each field	Major: 30 Semester hours Minor: 21 Semester hours Area of Concentration: 48 hours (must have a major or area of concentration to be certified)	12 Semester hours based on teaching level	12 Semester hours based on teaching level	12 Semester hours based on teaching level
NTE Tests	General Knowledge Commun. Skills Profess. Knowledge Specialty	General Knowledge Commun. Skills Profess. Knowledge Specialty	General Knowledge Commun. Skills Profess. Knowledge Specialty			
Internship	1 year	1 year	1 year			
5 Year Renewal	1st renewal - 15 program credit hours toward planned 5th year 2nd renewal - Completed MA or one of five non-degree options if in speciality area. Thereafter - 3 years experience or six hours graduate credit			Three years experience or six hours graduate credit		
SOURCE: DOE and Program Review and Investigations Staff						

APPENDIX E

Definitions of Certification Components

The following definitions apply to the provisional certificate.

The General Education component is directed at helping the individual function intelligently as a human being, emphasizing: (1) personal fulfillment through physical and mental health, philosophy, creative expression; (2) developing understanding skills and information through language arts, math and science; and (3) understanding the natural and social environments through the scientific method, complexity of the world, social forces and social systems.

The professional education component is designed around the teaching level selected by the candidate and includes human growth and development, education in society, classroom management, clinical and field experiences. The twelve-hour student teaching program is the culmination of the program.

The related studies component solely applies to the K-4 program, requiring credit in the math, arts and humanities, health and physical education directly related to the teaching level.

The academic specialization component is the most specific area for a candidate. It corresponds to the "major" and/or "minor" segments of the baccalaureate degree, presumably designed for the specific student, to meet the general requirements of the DOE and the institution.

Before a candidate may begin an internship program, he must successfully pass (15 percentile) the National Teacher Examinations (NTE) for general knowledge, communication skills, professional skills and an appropriate specialty test. According to KRS 161.030(4), these written "tests shall measure those concepts, ideas and facts which are being taught in teacher education programs in Kentucky." It appears that there are seven specialty tests designed around the elementary and middle levels, librarian and special education. Additionally there are 37 specialty tests designed for the high school level, according to the teacher preparation handbook.

Further, KRS 161.030 (7, 8, 9 & 10) define and outline the next step in teacher preparation - the one-year internship program, whereby the performance of a newly certified teacher is closely monitored by a three-member committee (school principal, a resource teacher and a teacher educator). The committee is charged with determining the progress and improvement of the teacher intern by regular observations of classroom performance, by review of the intern's teaching materials and by review of the teacher's responses to committee recommendations. Currently, the intern is critiqued by

the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS). Kentucky is in the process of developng its own instrument based on the FPMS.

The components applicable to provisional certificate renewal and standard certificate are quite similar but are designed (for the individual) to improve professional competency and to extend the scope of competency into areas not covered by the initial certificate. These certificates indicate that both professional education and academic specialization components have been addressed.

APPENDIX F

Problems with Supply and Demand Projections

There is considerable controversy over the extent to which this nation faces a major shortage of teachers. Some education analysts are highly critical of the projections used to support claims of impending shortages. Their criticisms are, in part, based upon some questionable assumptions used to generate supply and demand projections. This appendix explores some of the problems associated with supply and demand studies.

Supply projections are often based upon a complex set of assumptions involving: the number of new teachers entering the system; the reserve pool of teachers not currently working; individuals transferring from out of state; and the number of teachers returning to their posts from the previous year

According to the Rand Corporation report, Assessing Teacher Supply and Demand, accurate projections of teacher supply require information on ages, credentials, and teaching specialties, as well as information on dates of entry into the field and sources of teacher supply. With regard to the latter, useful estimates of teacher supply must consider data on two sources of teacher candidates: students in the training "pipeline" who will enter the profession within a few years, and the "reserve pool" of trained individuals who are not currently working in the schools.

The demand for teachers is influenced primarily by three variables: enrollment trends, changes in teacher/pupil ratios, and teacher turnover due to deaths, retirements, layoffs, and career changes

Unfortunately, these factors do not produce unambiguous clues to the number of teachers needed annually. For instance, an increase in student enrollment does not necessarily produce an immediate, proportional increase in the number of teachers.

One of the major criticisms leveled at supply and demand studies involves the failure to consider the size of the reserve pool of teachers in projecting supply figures

For example, the NCES survey projected trends in the number of new teacher graduates as the only future source of supply for classroom teachers. However, a 50-state survey conducted by the National Center for Education Information (NCEI) revealed that a significant number of positions are being filled by older individuals re-entering the teaching force.

Perhaps the most significant criticism of supply and demand projections is the failure to collect data on teacher turnover

For instance, the NCES investigators assumed that the rate of attrition for teachers has remained constant over the years at 6%. However, the researchers at the Rand Corp. suggest that there is good evidence that turnover rates vary over time. Turnover rates are greatly affected by the age composition of the teaching force, labor market conditions, and school policies. Data provided by school administrators on the number of teachers leaving the profession could produce useful analyses of turnover rates.

In the final analysis, projections of supply and demand do not afford a totally accurate picture of teacher shortages or surpluses: Most school districts only rarely encounter absolute shortages in which no candidates are available to fill a position

School administrators can temporarily solve the problem of vacancies by using several different strategies. For instance, a state can respond to a shortage of math teachers by increasing the number of emergency certificates issued or by expanding the size of classes. Consequently, those monitoring teacher shortages should pay careful attention to several aspects of the teacher labor market. Tracking multiple indicators is necessary because state and local school district policies can make adjustments to a tight labor market on either the supply or the demand side. The Rand Corporation report identifies seven potential indicators of a tight teacher labor market:

- Increases in real salary levels--especially for beginning teachers;
- Increases in emergency certifications;
- Increases in "full-time" substitute teachers;
- Increases in the average number of offers received by new education majors;
- Increases in the number and average duration of vacancies;
- Increases in class size;
- Increased occurrences of out-of-field teaching

Researchers at Murray State University are now reviewing teacher supply and demand at the request of the Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence. Tracking the efforts of these investigators should provide valuable information about the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of future research in this area. In any area of research, the aim is to provide the highest degree of precision with the minimum expenditure of resources. Supply and demand projections may allow policymakers to respond quickly to problems developing in geographical areas or in a particular subject matter. On the other

hand, the supply and demand of teachers in the Commonwealth may be monitored in the most cost-effective manner by annual surveys of school district superintendents and careful attention to alternative indicators of teacher shortages. The experiences of the researchers at Murray State University will shed some light on the best way to monitor supply and demand in the state.

APPENDIX G

Standards Boards¹ with Major Teacher Representation

1. Colorado Commission on Teacher Education and Certification

Membership No.: 10

Membership Composition²: teachers (5); principal (1); system-wide (1); administrator district program supervisor (1); dean or chair of a SCDE (1); SCDE faculty member (1); state education commissioner

Selection: SBE appoints members

Autonomous: N

Recommends/Advises SBE: Y

Scope/Duties: Advises SBE on standards and professions; administers 5 year accreditation of SCDEs; conducts periodic reviews of state program approval and certification standards.

2. Florida Education Standards Commission (ESC)

Membership No.: 24

Membership Composition²: teachers (12); superintendent (1); principal (1); school personnel officer (1); teacher education inservice director (1); school board members (2); citizens (2); administrative rep. from the ESC (1); and higher education representatives (3)

Selection: Governor appoints members

Autonomous: N

Recommends/Advises SBE: NA

Scope/Duties: Responsibilities include: teacher recruitment; subject matter competency; clinical education; governance; accreditation and program approval; the Professional Practices Commission handles disciplinary actions.

3. Louisiana State Certification and Teacher Education Advisory Council

Membership No.: 11

Membership Composition²: teachers (7); representatives of school exec. assoc. (1) and school supt.'s assoc. (1); SCDE dean (1); SDE representative (1)

Selection: NA

Autonomous: N

Recommends/Advises SBE: Y

Scope/Duties: Advises SBE on various issues relating to teacher preparation and certification.

4. Minnesota Board of Teaching (MBT)

Membership No.: 10

Membership Composition²: teachers (7); principal (1); SCDE representative (1); lay member (1)

Selection: Governor appoints members

Autonomous: Y

Recommends/Advises SBE: N

Scope/Duties: Establishes certification, entry and exit standards.

5. Missouri Advisory Council for the Certification of Educators (MACCE)

Membership No.: 25

Membership Composition²: teachers (15) other members from: IHEs, school boards to administrator associations

Selection: NA

Autonomous: N

Recommends/Advises SBE: Y

Scope/Duties: Initially develops new state certification regulations; the SBE must adopt all changes.

6. Montana Certification Standards Advisory Council**Membership No.:** 7**Membership Composition²:** teachers (4); SCDE faculty member (1); administrator (1); LEA trustee (1)**Selection:** Legislature created advisory council council in 1987**Autonomous:** N**Recommends/Advises SBE:** Y**Scope/Duties:** Advises the Board of Public Education on program approval and certification regulations.**7. North Carolina Professional Practices Commission****Membership No.:** 14**Membership Composition²:** teachers (7); administrators (3); SCDE representatives (4)**Selection:** SBE created the Commission in November 1987**Autonomous:** N**Recommends/Advises SBE:** Y**Scope/Duties:** Advises SBE on teacher preparation and certification issues.**8. Pennsylvania Professional Standards Commission****Membership No.:** 16**Membership Composition²:** teachers (8); principals (2); superintendents (1); SCDE representatives (3); student (1); lay member (1)**Selection:** Governor appoints members**Autonomous:** N**Recommends/Advises SBE:** Y**Scope/Duties:** Advises the SBE on matters relating to teacher certification.

9. Virginia Teacher Education Advisory Committee

Membership No.: 17

Membership Composition²: teachers (9); superintendent (1); local board member (1); SCDE representative (2); public IHE representative (1); state agency representative (1); lay members (2)

Selection: SBE appoints members

Autonomous: N

Recommends/Advises SBE: Y

Scope/Duties: Advises the SBE on development and approval of SCDE preparation programs.

10. W. Virginia Advisory Council on Professional Development of Education Personnel

Membership No.: 27

Membership Composition²: Public school representatives (12); IHE representatives (12); lay members (3); *one-half of council must be practicing teachers

Selection: NA

Autonomous: N

Recommends/Advises SBE: Y

Scope/Duties: Advises SBE on teacher education and certification.

11. Wyoming Professional Standards Board

Membership No.: 12

Membership Composition²: Teachers (6); principals (2); superintendent (1); public SCDE representatives (2); private IHE representative (1)

Selection: SBE appoints members

Autonomous: N

Recommends/Advises SBE: Y

Scope/Duties: Advises on certification standards and program approval.

Notes:

¹Standards Boards is defined in the source document as: Any official state entity which recommends or establishes standards for schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDE) entry and exit, for program approval, and for certification. This type of agency may have final regulatory authority or many simply advise other state policy makers.

²Data reflects boards with at least 50% teacher representation.

Source of Data: Excerpt of data from "Teacher Education in the States: 50 - State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions." American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1987.

Source: LRC, Program Review, 1989.

Appendix H

PROGRAM REVIEW AND INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE
KENTUCKY'S TEACHER PREPARATION SYSTEM
Recommendation Worksheet
7633K

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Use of Competencies for coursework	
The State Board of Education should encourage education institutions to use proficiency tests, previous education and unusual experience as permitted in 704 KAR 20:030 and 704 KAR 15:040 more frequently in order to permit qualified individuals to obtain endorsements and certifications more expeditiously.	
AGENCY RESPONSE	COMMITTEE ACTION
DOE: Agrees. Since regulations already exist, the Kentucky Department of Education will remind institutions of these options annually and request that they establish internal guidelines for exercising them.	ADOPTED 4/3/89

RECOMMENDATION 2: Planned Fifth-Year Program

The State Board of Education should modify 704 KAR 20:020 to require that the following teacher assessments be addressed and incorporated (where appropriate) into the "approved plan" leading to a master's degree or equivalent fifth-year program:

- The final report of the teacher's internship committee;
- Objective(s) of the teacher's district evaluation growth plan; and
- Written observations made by the teacher's district supervisor/evaluator.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

Disagrees. The new Kentucky teacher internship plan being phased-in includes the development of a professional development plan for each intern during their first year of employment. At the time this is fully implemented (1991-92) the individual will have a plan available which may be used for the fifth year program. Decisions concerning choice of coursework are most appropriately made by the individual and his/her advisor. The use of growth plans or evaluations of the individual performance should be the professional choice of the individual rather than a requirement imposed by state regulation.

Agrees with Amended Recommendation

CTEC:

Disagrees. The fifth year program is meant to "round-off" the preparation of a classroom teacher by building upon the knowledge and skills acquired at the baccalaureate level. Decisions concerning choice of coursework are most appropriately made by the individual and the graduate advisor. The use of growth plans or evaluations should be by individual professional choice rather than state requirement.

No comment on Amended Recommendation

AMENDED TO READ:

The State Board of Education should modify 704 KAR 20:020 to have the following teacher assessments, which are relevant at the time, considered in an advisory way when developing the "approved plan" leading to a master's degree or equivalent fifth year program:

- The final report of the teacher's internship committee;
- Objective(s) of the teacher's district evaluation growth plan; and
- Written observations made by the teacher's district supervisor/evaluator.

ADOPTED AS AMENDED 5/1/89

RECOMMENDATION 3: Survey of Local District In-Service Needs

The SBE should modify 704 KAR 3:035 to ensure that all teachers in local school districts are surveyed or have an opportunity to make suggestions as to the content and design of local in-service programs.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

The Kentucky Department of Education supports this recommendation. The Department presently encourages local districts to seek input from every staff member when planning in-service programs, but the Department has had no authority to require this.

ADOPTED 4/3/89

RECOMMENDATION 4: Cost and Effectiveness Study of In-Service Day

The Department of Education should study the cost and effectiveness of requiring a that portion of the local district in-service programs be based upon individual teacher needs either by:

- devoting one of the four current in-service days to flexible individual professional development; or
- adding one additional day of in-service to the calendar year for individual professional development.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

The Kentucky Department of Education should study the cost and effectiveness of the local district in-service programs. If additional days of in-service are funded, the Department could support days being identified for individual professional development.

ADOPTED 4/3/89

RECOMMENDATION 5: Continue Research on Alternative Compensation

The General Assembly and the SBE should continue to research alternative teacher compensation systems which are based on demonstrated professional ability.

AGENCY RESPONSE	COMMITTEE ACTION
<p>DOE: Disagrees. The Kentucky Department of Education supports increases in teacher salaries that will continue to attract the most qualified individuals into the profession. An alternative classification system should be considered only in the context of such increases in teacher salaries.</p> <p>No comment on Amended Recommendation.</p>	<p>AMENDED TO READ:</p> <p>The General Assembly and the SBE should continue to monitor research on alternative teacher compensation systems which are based on demonstrated professional ability.</p>

ADOPTED AS AMENDED 4/3/89

CTEC:

Disagrees. The state has spent approximately \$2.6 million in the last four years in developing, researching and piloting a Career Ladder Program. Further research will not yield any additional information in this area. Resources would be better utilized in funding identified educational priorities that do not include continued pursuit of a career ladder program.

No comment on Amended Recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Standardize Teacher Evaluation Process

The SBE should standardize the teacher evaluation process in order to improve teacher's confidence in the impartiality and equity of the process.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

Disagree. The Kentucky Department of Education does not support the recommendation to standardize the teacher evaluation process statewide. All local school districts were required to develop evaluation plans for certified personnel using a committee of teachers and administrators. All local plans must reflect guidelines as set forth in 704 KAR 3:345. These regulations were updated at the November, 1988, State Board meeting. Each district evaluation plan is monitored yearly by the Kentucky Department of Education. The crucial factors which ensure impartiality and equity of the evaluation process are the skills and training of the local district evaluators.

AMENDED TO READ:

The SBE should incorporate a review of the teacher evaluation plan mandated in 704 KAR 3:345, and its application, into the accreditation process as a means of improving teacher confidence in the impartiality and equity of the process.

ADOPTED AS AMENDED 5/1/89

Agrees with Amended Recommendation.

CTEC:

Disagree. Current state guidelines ensure that local districts establish proper procedures in evaluating instructional personnel and also provide some uniformity statewide. The evaluation of personnel is the responsibility of the employer and is an integral ingredient of the employer-employee relationship. A single state system for evaluation would only intrude and damage this relationship.

No comment on Amended Recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Establish a Centralized Data Base

The Department of Education, with the assistance of the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Occupational Information Coordinating Council, should compile available supply and demand related information into one centralized data base.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

ADOPTED 4/3/89

DOE: Agrees. The Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Department of Education are currently engaged in sharing data on teacher education and certification. A formal protocol for sharing data will be developed and implemented.

CHE: Agrees as long as the intent of the recommendation is that the designated agencies combine available data for use as an indicator of supply and demand conditions.

KOICC: Agrees. All of the supply-demand data bases which we have are disseminated to DOE and CHE for utilization as they deem appropriate, since they are both member agencies of the KOICC. We do not deal with surpluses and shortages of specialty teaching fields since our demand information is supplied by the Occupational Employment Statistics program of the Department for Employment Services and the instrument used does not include specialty areas. In all probability, the only way to determine local needs in specialty areas may be through a special survey with the one hundred seventy-seven local education agencies. They would be the most likely source of current shortages, as they know how many teachers are "out of field". By looking closely at the State Data Centers statistical reports on births/ deaths, a reasonable projection report could be assembled. CHE could provide enrollment figures in the specialty areas to ascertain a truer picture of the shortages which exist.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Report Current Employment Trends

The Department of Education, with the assistance of the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority, should publish and disseminate an annual report detailing the current employment trends of graduates from the state's teacher preparation institutions and information on available financial assistance for students who wish to pursue a career in education. Each teacher preparation institution should provide a current copy of this report to students entering a preparation program.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

ADOPTED 4/3/89

DOE:

Agrees. At the present time, institutions are required to acquaint prospective teachers, at the point of admission to a preparation program, of the current employment trends for graduates of that program. The Kentucky Department of Education will initiate data collection for an annual report and summary of employment trends for teachers.

CHE:

Agrees with basic intent, but questions how easily this can be accomplished. The accuracy of such a report is paramount if students use it to consider current and expected employment opportunities when making career decisions. Methodology would have to involve extensive surveying of recent graduates of teacher education programs, which would be time-consuming and expensive. In addition to cost considerations, public policy implications, such as the policy objectives of state government in attempting to influence career choices, or the approach state government should take with regard to shortages or surpluses in given fields or other occupations, should be acknowledged.

KHEAA:

Agrees.

RECOMMENDATION 9: Study Areas of Critical Shortage

The Department of Education, the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority should study teacher supply and demand in the Commonwealth. The study should focus on how the state is currently dealing with shortages in foreign languages, mathematics, science, special education, and computer science. Furthermore, the study should examine the problems of recruiting minority teachers. Strategies for dealing with critical shortages in these areas should also be addressed. Prior to the 1990 session of the General Assembly, the Department of Education should report its findings to the Education Committee.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

ADOPTED 4/3/89

DOE: Agrees. The Kentucky Department of Education agrees that such a study should be undertaken. We will initiate action in collaboration with the Council on Higher Education and the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority to undertake such a study.

CHE: Agrees if the recommendation does not entail a detailed supply and demand study and does not call for formal supply and demand projections.

KHEAA: Agrees. KHEAA will provide data about the impacts of teacher scholarships, math, science incentive loans and Paul Douglas Scholarships upon "critical shortages."

RECOMMENDATION 10: Continue Strengthening SBE's Accreditation Process

The State Board of Education should continue its efforts to strengthen the existing accreditation and program approval process. The five-year cycle of accreditation visits should be maintained.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

Agrees. In recent years, the accreditation/program approval process has been greatly strengthened. The State Board adopted revised national accreditation standards for all Kentucky institutes. Kentucky was one of the first states to be awarded national recognition by NCATE for its program approval and accreditation procedures. The State Board of Education continues to provide support for the revised and strengthened accreditation and program approval process. All twenty-five teacher preparation institutions are now in compliance with the five year cycle of accreditation. To ensure that the cycle is maintained, additional funding should be earmarked for program approval and accreditation. The Kentucky Department of Education will make recommendations to this effect at the next legislative session.

ADOPTED 4/3/89

RECOMMENDATION 11: Coordinate CHE and SBE Program Reviews

The State Board of Education and the Council on Higher Education should coordinate their reviews of teacher preparation programs in an effort to reduce the burden placed on colleges and universities.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

Agrees. Staff members of both agencies are already working to coordinate data collection requests, and to share data that both agencies require.

CHE:

Agrees. The Council on Higher Education has been interested in this merger for a number of years and will continue to pursue its feasibility. To date, the joint use of data, materials, and findings has not been practical due to the different emphases of the reviews. The Council's review stresses the need for, and viability of, programs, while the Department's review stresses compliance with standards for curriculum, faculty, facilities, and resources. The use of performance-related data by the Department would increase the likelihood of the proposed merger.

ADOPTED 4/3/89

RECOMMENDATION 12: Develop Valid Outcome Measures for Program Approval

The State Board of Education should have the Department of Education incorporate existing performance indicators in the accreditation process and, with the assistance of the CHE, develop more valid outcome measures for inclusion in the next 5-year program accreditation cycle.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

Agrees. The Kentucky Department of Education staff are currently working with the Council on Higher Education and the Council on Teacher Education and Certification to investigate and identify better outcome measures that are appropriate for use in the accreditation process. One CTEC working group, the Core curriculum Committee, has been charged with identifying the knowledge and skills that all beginning teachers must have, regardless of their subject area focus. When this committee's work is finished, it will direct the core professional training for all teachers, and provide the basis for performance indicators for which the preparing institutions can be held accountable.

CHE:

Agrees. The Council is committed to using outcome measures in its academic program review procedures, which are being revised, and it plans to use the measures that are developed for SACS, NCATE, AACSB rather than developing unique measures. The role of outcome measures which are derived from the objectives of individual programs is to assess the performance of the program in terms of its stated objectives and provide the basis for improving its performance in the future. Thus, the use of outcome measures developed for NCATE and the State Board will not pose any problems for the Council.

CTEC:

The revised standards for accreditation of teacher education require follow-up studies of program graduates by preparing institutions. However, we oppose over-reliance on performance measures for accreditation teacher education institutions. The current system relies on the professional judgement of qualified professionals trained in applying the standards. The data and information on which such judgements are based includes an appropriate balance of both input and output measures. Reliance on outcome measure alone would discriminate against program graduates serving in unusual or difficult situations such as with special populations or in remote geographic regions.

RECOMMENDATION 13: SBE and CHE Coordination

The State Board of Education should amend 704 KAR 20:005 to require that "determination of sufficient demand for training for a position" be made in consideration with a statement from the Executive Director of the Council on Higher Education on resources available for establishment of a new program or programs in teacher education colleges.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

ADOPTED ON 5/1/89

DOE: The Council's role relates to approval of programs. The allocation of funds to individual programs is made by the institution. However, the Council's role is restricted to the eight public institutions and does not involve seventeen independent colleges.

CTEC: It is our understanding that the Council on Higher Education reviews and approves programs and provides funding to institutions based on a formula. The institution then determines allocation to specific programs. Such allocations should be based on the demand for the program.

CHE: Agrees. While a fiscal impact statement should be developed for changes in certification requirements, this statement would need to come from the individual institutions. The Executive Director could coordinate the submission of these statements.

NEW RECOMMENDATION PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE 5/1/89

RECOMMENDATION #14: Professional Development Centers

The General Assembly should fund, and the State Board of Education should develop and administer a pilot program to establish three professional development centers in eastern, western, and northern Kentucky for a three-year period. The regional professional development centers would provide training programs that would allow teachers to complete the in-service requirements for recertification, and would also establish a level of training programs suitable as an option to the traditional Master's or Fifth-Year Program. An independent evaluation should be part of the program. An evaluation report should be forwarded to the General Assembly within six months of the program's end.

The plan and budget proposal developed by the State Board of Education should be submitted to the Interim Joint Committee on Education prior to the 1990 Regular Session of the General Assembly.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

Agrees.

CHE:

Agrees.

AMENDED TO READ:

The General Assembly should fund, and the State Board of Education should develop and administer a pilot program to establish three professional development centers for a three-year period. The regional professional development centers would provide training programs that will allow teachers to complete the in-service requirements for recertification, and would also establish a level of training programs suitable as an option to the traditional Master's or Fifth-Year Program. An independent evaluation should be part of the program. An evaluation report should be forwarded to the General Assembly within six months of the program's end.

The plan and budget proposal developed by the State Board of Education should be submitted to the Interim Joint Committee on Education prior to the 1990 Regular Session of the General Assembly.

ADOPTED AS AMENDED 5/1/89.

NEW RECOMMENDATION PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE 5/1/89

RECOMMENDATION #15: Professional Standards Board

A new Section of KRS Chapter 161 should be established to create a professional standards board responsible for the issuance, suspension, renewal and revocation of certificates for Kentucky teachers and regulation of the Kentucky Beginning Teacher Internship Program. The professional standards board should be an autonomous body with members appointed by the Governor. The membership should be composed predominantly of teachers with representation from the following: school administrators, teacher educators, higher education representatives and lay representation.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

No comment.

ADOPTED 5/1/89

NEW RECOMMENDATION PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE 5/1/89

RECOMMENDATION #16: Part-time Specialized Instructors

A new section of KRS Chapter 161 should be created requiring the State Board of Education to establish regulations governing the qualifications and the utilization of persons from other professions with demonstrated expertise in their respective areas of education, training or professional experience. These regulations should specify the minimum essential competencies which must be demonstrated by any person seeking certification as a part-time instructor of subjects related to his or her areas of expertise and should establish and require competency tests if deemed necessary.

Holders of this certificate should be employed on an annual contract basis and not be eligible for continuing service status or for retirement provisions.

Local school boards could contract with such certificated instructors for part-time services on an hourly, daily or other periodic basis as best meets the needs of the board.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

Agrees.

ADOPTED 5/1/89

NEW RECOMMENDATION PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE 5/1/89

RECOMMENDATION #17: Review of Certification Categories

The State Board of Education, the Council on Higher Education, and the Council on Teacher Education and Certification should establish a task force composed of members selected from each body to review all existing specialized certification categories for teachers and other school personnel. The membership should also include the Superintendent of Public Instruction. On or before November 1, 1989, the task force should submit a report to the State Board, the Council on Teacher Education and Certification and the Legislative Research Commission regarding the continuation, discontinuation or combination of specific certification categories.

AGENCY RESPONSE

COMMITTEE ACTION

DOE:

Agrees.

CHE:

Agrees.

CTEC:

Agrees.

ADOPTED 5/1/89

